DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 343 CE 055 690

AUTHOR Grubb, W. Norton; And Others
TITLE Case Studies for Order amidst Complexity: The Status of Coordination among Vocational Education, Job Training Partnership Act, and Welfare-to-Work Programs. Report to the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Labor.
INSTITUTION National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Aug 90
CONTRACT V051A80004-89
NOTE 117p.; For the accompanying report, see CE 055 689.
AVAILABLE FROM NCRVE Materials Distribution Service, Western Illinois University, 46 Horrabin Hall, Macomb, IL 61455 (Order No. MDS-214: $5.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Adults; *Agency Cooperation; Education Work Relationship; Outcomes of Education; Out of School Youth; Performance Contracts; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; State Government; *Vocational Education; *Welfare Services; Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS Georgia; Illinois; *Job Training Partnership Act 1982; Massachusetts; Minnesota; Tennessee; Washington

ABSTRACT

This document provides the case studies for an original report on the status of coordination among job related education and training programs. The document contains case studies of state-level coordination in Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Tennessee, and Washington. It also includes a section on coordination in selected California Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). To compile the case studies, interviews were conducted with state officials in the secondary and postsecondary vocational education system, officials involved in Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) administration, and individuals from the welfare department of each state. Additionally, administrators in vocational education, JTPA, and welfare-to-work programs were interviewed in two to five local areas in each state. Five communities were selected in California where vocational education officials, SDA administrators, and welfare-to-work administrators were interviewed. Each of the state-level case studies begins by discussing state-level efforts, and then goes on to efforts and activities on the local level. (CML)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED323343

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kaufman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CASE STUDIES FOR
ORDER AMIDST COMPLEXITY:
THE STATUS OF COORDINATION AMONG VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT, AND WELFARE-TO-WORK PROGRAMS

Report to the U.S. Congress,
the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Labor
May 1990

W. Norton Grubb
University of California, Berkeley

Cynthia Brown, Phillip Kaufman
MPR Associates, Berkeley

John Lederer
University of California, Berkeley

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
University of California, Berkeley
1995 University Avenue, Suite 375
Berkeley, CA 94704

Supported by
The Office of Vocational and Adult Education,
U.S. Department of Education

August, 1990

MDS-214

CE055690

This publication is available from the:

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Materials Distribution Service
Western Illinois University
46 Horrabin Hall
Macomb, IL 61455

800-637-7652 (Toll Free)

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Grant Number:	V051A80004-89
Act under which Funds Administered:	Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act P.L. 98-524
Source of Grant:	Office of Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Washington, DC 20202
Grantee:	The Regents of the University of California National Center for Research in Vocational Education 1995 University Avenue, Suite 375 Berkeley, CA 94704
Director:	Charles S. Benson
Percent of Total Grant Financed by Federal Money:	100%
Dollar Amount of Federal Funds for Grant:	$5,744,000
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Grantees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Coordination in Georgia 1
Coordination in Illinois 15
Coordination in Massachusetts 24
Coordination in Minnesota 47
Coordination in Tennessee 68
Coordination in Washington 80
Coordination in Selected California SDAs 98

COORDINATION IN GEORGIA

Coordination between vocational education and job training programs in Georgia is mostly limited to local efforts. Beyond what is required in federal legislation, few state-level programs, initiatives, or working groups dedicated to coordinating these programs exist. As in other states we have seen, state administrators readily defer to local control in Georgia. Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Education Coordination grants are distributed to meet locally identified needs. Local coordinating councils (LCCs) advise state agencies on local needs and services for welfare-to-work program planning, and there are no state-sponsored efforts to consolidate or combine JTPA and vocational education funding streams. Where innovation can be found, it is most often the result of local initiative.

Georgia's vocational education institutions receive a major share of the state's JTPA training dollars and are often the service provider of choice. Proprietary schools are mostly in the Atlanta area. While community-based organizations (CBOs) are found throughout the state, they have received fewer and fewer JTPA contracts due to poor performance and, occasionally, fraud. Under-capitalization has prevented many CBOs from competing for performance-based JTPA contracts. Prominent in the employment and training system are the adult regional vocational-technical institutes.

Georgia's vocational-technical institutes provide educational services to adults and out-of-school youth throughout the state. In many parts of Georgia, especially the rural areas, the "vo-techs" are the only sources of technical training available locally. This makes them an important component of the employment and training system statewide, as well as the focus of many state and local coordination initiatives. One of the state initiatives is the establishment in Program Year 1989 (PY89) of a coordination liaison position in the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE), which administers the vo-techs, who will work with the Department of Labor (DOL), which administers JTPA statewide. The position is funded by JTPA 8-percent funds.

Coordination is made more difficult through a lack of coterminous planning boundaries. The state's Positive Employment and Community Help (PEACH)/Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program is implemented on a county-by-county basis—a long and arduous task considering the state has one hundred and fifty-nine counties, thirty-three of which are presently operating the JOBS program. In addition, the state's twenty-two service delivery areas (SDAs) may cross one or more of Georgia's

twenty-eight vo-tech service areas, and vice versa. The recent state-sponsored effort to establish JOBS LCCs using SDA boundaries is a notable attempt to address this issue.

Vocational Education Institutions

Vocational education in Georgia is divided between secondary and postsecondary delivery systems. Secondary vocational education is delivered through the local school districts, with state policy developed by the Georgia Board of Education. Administrative support for the board is provided by the Georgia Department of Education (DOE). The State Board of Post-Secondary Vocational Education develops policy for all postsecondary programs offered through thirty-nine technical institutes, centers, and colleges throughout the state. These programs are administered by the Georgia DTAE. In addition, Georgia has a separate system of thirty-three junior colleges and universities that is overseen by the Georgia Board of Regents. These institutions have very little contact with the Georgia DOL and the JTPA program.

In 1986, the newly created Post-Secondary Board was given jurisdiction by the State Board of Education over all postsecondary vocational education programs. Two years later, the Post-Secondary Board's administrative staff became a department separate from DOE forming a new Department of Technical and Adult Education. Since 1988, DTAE has been spending much of its time bringing the state's twenty-eight locally controlled technical institutes under its direct jurisdiction. The local school boards and county boards that previously ran the institutes have been replaced by new local operating boards comprised of educators and business leaders appointed by the state Post-Secondary Board. Presently, all but four of the vo-techs have, in this manner, come under direct state control. Additionally, for several years, the DTAE and the Board of Regents have jointly operated the occupational divisions at seven junior colleges. This arrangement allowed vocational services to expand to areas without technical institutes, without incurring the expense of a new facility.

DTAE perceives the mandate of the area technical institutes as "meeting the specific training needs of business and industry." The administrator we spoke with claimed DTAE was "less of an education-related agency," pointing to its strong relationship with the state Chamber of Commerce (located in the same building) and the appointment of many business executives to the Post-Secondary Vocational Education Board. DTAE administers the Quick Start program, which provides free customized training to new and expanding

industries throughout the state. The technical institutes are also an important source of training services in many SDAs, so they may potentially fill a critical role in matching employer labor demand with trained, economically disadvantaged workers in need of employment. Since DTAE now receives federal Adult Basic Education (ABE) funds, it may be in a stronger position to meet the needs of JTPA participants if it chooses to expand and coordinate its basic and vocational education offerings.

Perkins Allocation

In Georgia, federal vocational education funds are split evenly between secondary and postsecondary programs, with local education agencies (LEAs) applying to DOE and DTAE for funding. The Georgia State Board of Education is the sole state agent, and DOE is responsible for the planning and administration of federal vocational education funds. Neither department allocates Perkins funds for special programs, and DOE claims that it is rare for school districts to combine Perkins and JTPA funds (reportedly due to the different target populations of the two acts). While DTAE requires technical institutes to describe how Perkins funds will be coordinated with JTPA programs, such coordination rarely takes the form of combined funding supporting a single program. Perkins funds are not used to support Quick Start projects.

State-level Coordinated Policy Development and Programs

Coordinating the System

The recent creation of the DTAE with administrative control over vocational, technical, and adult basic education in the technical institutes may be interpreted as an attempt to more precisely delineate secondary and postsecondary services and institutions, a movement which began with the creation of the Post-Secondary Vocational Education Board. Unlike other states, Georgia has sought to sharpen the distinction between secondary and postsecondary service delivery systems, and in so doing has similarly divided vocational education programs. The takeover of the technical institutes by DTAE from what had previously been locally controlled (in some cases school board controlled) institutions, is an example of "turf consolidation." School districts administered under DOE and the Board of Education are reducing services to adults through adult education programs.

The effect this consolidation will have on program coordination is not certain. Consolidation may increase the need for articulation agreements between institutions to improve the transition from school to work. Dropout prevention and re-entry programs may be hampered by technical institutes offering attractive programs to out-of-school youth. JTPA and JOBS programs that serve both youth and adults will find it necessary to work closely with technical institutes *and* local school districts, while this may not have been necessary before. There may be an improvement in program quality as institutions begin to focus on programs targeted to specific groups with different needs and the multi-purpose school building becomes more rare.

Contact between DOE, DOL, and DTAE administrators is, for the most part, limited to the statutory mandates. Representatives of all three departments sit on the Governor's Employment and Training Council (the state job training coordinating council) that develops policy for all DOL programs, including JTPA, economic development, unemployment insurance, and employment service. The Governor's Employment and Training Council will, in the future, work with the Department of Human Resources (DHR) on JOBS program policy, but will not set policy for the program. Final policy-setting authority resides with DHR.

In 1988, the Georgia Council on Vocational Education convened a working group of five state-level vocational education and job training agencies to develop a report on state-level vocational education/job training coordination. The final result, released in February 1989, is a set of shared goals and action plans called *An Agenda for Vocational Education: Shared Goals for the Next Five Years*. Some administrators were unsatisfied with the document, characterizing it as a restatement of existing agency goals and plans. They felt that while the effort may have informed some departments about what other state agencies were doing, it did little to encourage coordination, consolidation, or modification of existing program plans or to encourage joint planning on a more permanent basis. Nevertheless, the Council continues to work toward implementing the goals stated in the document.

JTPA Education Coordination Grants

The Georgia DOE administers the state's JTPA Education Coordination Grant program (8-percent funds) through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. LEAs, including state-run technical institutes and junior colleges, may apply for funding to DOE,

which usually funds only those projects that are approved by the local private industry council (PIC). In this way, local priorities determine how Education Coordination grants are used. Several state and local program administrators stated that many PICs viewed 8-percent funds as another pool of money to fund regular Title II-A programs. Few SDAs used 8-percent funds to target hard-to-serve participant groups or to fund experimental projects. Eight-percent funds are most often used to contract with local LEAs for services complimenting regular Title II-A programs, thus freeing Title II-A funds for other services or contracts with CBOs and proprietary service providers.

DOE's 8-percent implementation plan recommends use of the funds for Title II-A and Title III programs such as remedial education and General Education Development (GED) preparation, service to special populations, and educational support (counseling and other retention activities) for individually referred JTPA participants enrolled in technical institutes. Many SDAs have chosen the last option. Almost sixty percent of the DOE's 8-percent funds go to DTAE's technical institutes. Local PICs have found that many technical institutes are not adept at providing training and support services to economically disadvantaged workers who have multiple barriers to employment—barriers that may hinder the client's ability to stay in training or secure employment once training is completed. Several SDAs have chosen to use 8-percent funds to provide additional counseling and employability skills/placement services to the clients they refer to the local technical institute. Often this takes the form of hiring an additional counselor with 8-percent funds to work with JTPA-sponsored students, as at the program in Athens. Officials at DOL believe that if the technical institutes were more committed to serving economically disadvantaged students, they would be providing these services with DTAE funds and 8-percent funds could be used for other purposes.

Twenty percent of the state's 8-percent funds are reserved for statewide coordination activities. Presently, the funds are used to hire four regional coordinators who work with the PICs and LEAs in applying for funds, to provide technical assistance, and to monitor existing contracts. Beginning in PY89, these funds will also be used to hire a JTPA coordinator at DTAE who will facilitate coordination with DOE and DOL. The coordinator will also help develop links between JTPA and the Quick Start program. The 8-percent reserve has been used to develop a counseling manual for LEAs serving JTPA clients and standard youth competencies for JTPA and school district use.

PEACH/JOBS Coordination

In 1986, Georgia implemented its comprehensive welfare-to-work program called Positive Employment and Community Help or PEACH. Since then, funding for the program has gradually increased as new counties have begun implementation to the present level of $3 million in state funds, combined with $1.8 million in federal Work Incentive (WIN) Demonstration funds. As of July 1, 1989, the thirty-three counties that were operating PEACH/WIN services (which represent sixty-one percent of the adult Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] caseload) were converted to the new JOBS program. Georgia was among the first group of thirteen states to implement JOBS. This entailed developing state JOBS and support service plans consistent with the requirements of the act. Few program or service modifications were needed to conform with JOBS requirements. The one exception is the inclusion of an additional eighty-four hundred clients with children between the ages of three and six, who are mandatory participants under JOBS. Approximately forty thousand adults will be required to participate in JOBS, representing fifty-five percent of the adults receiving AFDC in the state.

Even in the counties where PEACH has been operating for two years, implementation is slow. One county had just eight percent of its total caseload enrolled in a JOBS activity. While the state plans to implement JOBS in all counties by mid-1992, it will take considerably longer to get the entire mandatory caseload enrolled in services. State administrators confided that they were worried about achieving the tight enrollment goals set for AFDC-Unemployed recipients under the legislation.

Currently, DHR does not plan to use JOBS funds to purchase any training services and instead plans to use the existing free training programs through the employment service, JTPA, and ABE systems. JOBS money will be used exclusively for client support. Presently, the state could potentially access $31 million in state and local funds if it were willing to make the commitment to match all the federal funds available for state use. This is not likely to happen if the state uses existing training resources.

To facilitate access to local resources like JTPA, DHR has established twenty LCCs to identify local needs and resources for JOBS implementation. These LCCs are established by the local PICs and have the same geographic jurisdictions as SDAs. LCCs may be a subcommittee of the PIC or a totally separate committee, but each PIC must have one. The LCCs have no administrative powers but are designed to advise state and local DHR offices on the types of services to offer and where to get them. It is anticipated that

local requests for additional LEA training ca
DHR who will consolidate them and lobby
from the state. The details of how this proc
training capacity in local areas is filled.

Unlike other states, there is no single
services that local offices must offer. There a
high school diploma complete one or the oth
Employability Development Plan (EDP) wit
choice source of occupational skills training.
services of JTPA contractors refer clients to
refers them to a training contractor.

County welfare offices are not statuto
so they may only purchase specific services fo
must be done through DHR in Atlanta—a pot
as more clients are enrolled in JOBS and
training. Central administration of all service
staff at DHR, a difficult process that requires

The Health and Human Services-app
child care will be guaranteed *to the extent res*
funds may not be available to meet client ne
activity will not be required, in accordance wi
1, 1989, DHR moved from state-level contra
the purchase of day care for each AFDC clie
state certified/registered and local offices may
limit of $60.00 per week. Transportation a
$3.00 per day for each. Also available are
wear, dental services, tools and supplies, testi

It is impossible to know precisely h
because the state does not have a centralize
each county office will have a client man
department's mainframe. Despite this lack
largest group of clients are receiving remedia
a high school degree or the basic skills to pa

training capacity will be sent to the Commissioner of
ınd lobby for additional funding of training programs
/ this process will work will become clearer as excess
led.

; no single model for the source or sequence of training
:r. There are requirements that clients without a GED or
: or the other, and that employment counselors draft an
(EDP) with the client. JTPA is designated as the first
ls training. Local welfare offices wishing to access the
r clients to the SDA, which enrolls them in JTPA and

not statutorily authorized to commit future DHR funds,
services for specific clients. All contracting for services
anta—a potential bottleneck that may become a problem
OBS and there is greater need to purchase class-size
f all service contracts may make it necessary to increase
at requires legislative approval.

ervices-approved JOBS support services plan states that
e extent resources permit, recognizing that in some cases
et client needs. In those cases, participation in a JOBS
cordance with Family Support Act guidelines. As of July
evel contracting and management of day care services to
AFDC client by local county offices. Providers must be
offices may pay the local market rate or less, up to a state
portation and meal allowances are generally limited to
ailable are subsidies for car repair, medical exams, eye
pplies, testing fees, and after-school care.

precisely how many JOBS clients there are in Georgia
centralized MIS system. It will take two years before
client management system with on-line access to the
te this lack of data, DHR believes that, presently, the
ng remedial education. Most JOBS clients do not have a
skills to participate in occupational education programs.

Most remediation clients are referred to the technical institutes for education funded through the federal ABE system.

Quick Start Program

The Quick Start program is administered by the DTAE, Office of Economic Development Programs. The program seeks to create employment by providing free customized training to new and expanding firms through the state's twenty-eight area technical institutes. Quick Start focuses on technician and operator positions, but also provides some management and maintenance training. It does not offer training in clerical, custodial, or other occupations for which the supply of workers is sufficient. The program uses its own instructors and equipment or pays company personnel to conduct the training at their site.

A description of the program provided in employer information packets states that Georgia offers three programs to help employers find and train skilled workers: DTAE's technical institutes, Quick Start, and JTPA. The promotional literature states that for workers, JTPA "can provide training assistance, counseling, and help with child care or transportation expenses during the training period. For employers, it can reduce training costs or offer wage subsidies during on-the-job training (OJT), as well as screening assistance and tax credits." In this way, JTPA promotes economic development by reducing employer training costs. Quick Start clients who are co-enrolled in JTPA may receive support services during the training period, reducing the amount of training stipends that employers must provide.

Despite the attention given to JTPA coordination in the promotional literature, coordination is rare and occurs most often when SDA and local technical institute administrators agree to work together. Normally, the technical institutes turn to the DOL Employment Service to recruit trainees, but they may occasionally use the local SDA. Recently, a company in Canton looking for fifty welders recruited Quick Start clients from a group of dislocated women apparel workers enrolled in a Title III program. State officials have promoted this project as an example of effective coordination, but it has not yet been replicated.

Georgia Computer Campus—Atlanta

The Georgia Computer Campus is a project run by Goodwill Industries to train handicapped workers for computer programming or customer service occupations. About twenty percent of the program's funding comes from a JTPA 8-Percent Education Coordination grant. Additional funding comes from a special legislative grant through the Georgia DHR and the U.S. Department of Education's Projects with Industry program. Last year, forty-five workers were served with a total program budget of $305,000.

The Georgia Computer Campus has existed since 1979 and it has always been located at Georgia Tech in Atlanta. Six years ago, the Computer Campus was moved to the newly opened Advanced Technology Development Center (ATDC), a university-sponsored high technology business incubator, which provides subsidized rent in a modern facility with access to university services. According to ATDC rules, businesses may remain for up to six years, so this year the Computer Campus will be moving to another site off campus. Despite the move, it will continue to receive 8-percent funding through Georgia Tech.

The program initially received Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) funding and has continued to receive JTPA support each year through the 8-percent program. In accordance with the state's 8-percent guidelines, funding must come through a public education agency—in this case Georgia Tech University. The 8-percent grant is administered by the university's Georgia Tech Research Institute, which primarily manages defense contracts at a twenty-six percent administrative fee. However, the institute gave the Computer Campus center a break, and charged only $1,200 in administrative fees last year, instead of the standard $18,000. Through this and the subsidized rent at the development center, Georgia Tech provides the Computer Campus in-kind services.

Clients are referred to the program through DHR's Division of Rehabilitation Services and are tested to assess their ability to complete training and find employment. Clients must have a high school diploma or a GED and an eighth grade reading level. The Customer Service Representative Training Program provides twelve weeks of training in computer literacy, communication skills, and job search techniques. Last year, the program had a seventy-five percent placement rate and an average placement wage of $6.00 per hour. The Computer Programmer Training program is a nine month program providing training in data processing, programming and assembly languages, and data

structures. Last year, this program had a ninety percent placement rate with an average annual salary of $19,000.

The Computer Campus program provides rehabilitation services for clients throughout the state. But the use of JTPA 8-percent funds for the program does little to foster coordination. Most of the program's clients are JTPA-eligible because they are on public assistance, but their access to other Georgia Tech services is not increased as a result of the use of education coordination funding. In fact, besides the in-kind contributions Georgia Tech offers the program, the university does little else but funnel the money to Goodwill Industries. Goodwill is able to use the respected name of the university to market the program to employers. When the program is forced to move off campus at the end of 1989, the connection will be even more tenuous, although Georgia Tech will continue to administer the grant for the CBO.

De Kalb County DEFACS PEACH/JOBS Program—Decatur

The PEACH/JOBS program in De Kalb County presently has about three hundred clients representing eight percent of the caseload enrolled in services. Enrollment is not voluntary for the identified target groups in the mandated population (young parents or parents with older children), but others may elect to defer at this time. Presently, the sanction rate in the county is high at ten percent. Initially, an EDP is developed with the help of a Division of Family and Children Services (DEFACS) employment counselor and clients are sent to a one week job search workshop. There they receive a "pep talk," career development, job search, and financial aid information and are given a Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) by a De Kalb Technical Institute (DTI) instructor provided to DEFACS free of charge.

DTI also provides a teacher to conduct a GED class at the welfare office. The class has a capacity of twenty students, and the overflow is sent to DTI's other ABE-funded classes. Other than GED services, there is no basic education offered to JOBS clients who have a GED or high school diploma, except as part of a vocational training program. Clients may choose a vocational training program in which they would like to participate. If they have one in mind and the employment goals appear reasonable, they are offered support services and supplies through JOBS. Tuition is offered for the first quarter pending receipt of a Pell Grant, but otherwise there is no money available for educational expenses. Those who cannot receive full funding for their training or who do not suggest a

training provider are referred to the SDA for JTPA-sponsored training. Occasionally, the SDA refers JOBS-eligible clients to DEFACS so they may receive support services beyond what the SDA is capable of providing.

The DEFACS program administrator felt that referrals to JTPA were like a "black box." Once clients were referred to the SDA, DEFACS did not know where they would end up. DEFACS had requested, but had not received, more information about the SDA's programs so it could make specific training recommendations. Once referred to the SDA, many JOBS clients end up at DTI where the SDA makes most of its classroom occupational training referrals. Using JTPA allows DEFACS to secure training services free-of-charge and avoid paying client tuition costs through direct referrals to DTI.

The De Kalb County JOBS program has an LCC that was established by the PIC. As of August 1989, the LCC had not met, and DEFACS had not yet hired staff. DEFACS hopes the LCC will do most of the planning—identifying training needs and choosing and developing links with service providers. It may be able to improve coordination with the JTPA system, so that DEFACS counselors can direct clients to specific programs, or establish new programs.

Athens Area Technical Institute

The Athens Area Technical Institute (AATI) receives approximately $150,000 in Title II-A funding through the Northeast Georgia SDA for occupational education services on an individual referral basis. AATI's involvement in job training pre-dates JTPA and began during the CETA program. The SDA reimburses Athens Tech for books, fees, tuition, and supplies for JTPA-funded students, and also provides for child care and transportation payments to students. JTPA students apply for Pell Grants, which they use for various expenses arising during the twelve to twenty-four months they are JTPA participants.

AATI is the SDA's primary source of occupational education services, enrolling ninety-five JTPA clients in PY87. AATI is the SDA's highest cost training source (on a cost per placement basis), due to the high amounts of support services required to sustain a client in long-term training. Four years ago, the SDA switched from a performance-based, fixed unit cost contract to a cost reimbursement contract, which provides for the salaries of one and one-half counselors and half of a Clerical Assistant's salary. AATI has had a

chronic problem with retention, which has resulted in a low placement rate. In addition, the switch to cost reimbursement contracting has allowed students the flexibility to attend the school of their choice. The student's choice is based on the availability of courses of study and the location of the training institution. The SDA has Letters of Agreement with four technical institutes and two proprietary schools stipulating terms for individual referrals.

AATI receives an $11,100 JTPA 8-percent grant through the Georgia DOE, which provides for one half of the Clerical Assistant's support. The counselors funded under the cost-reimbursement contract are responsible for program recruitment, client intake, career counseling, education and support service coordination, tutoring, and job placement. The services of the JTPA staff are available to only the JTPA-sponsored students and are designed to increase the likelihood of program completion. Students are referred to the JTPA counselors if they need financial assistance, and they are free to choose from the PIC-approved vocational programs offered at the school. Remedial education services are available for those lacking the basic skills prerequisites for the program of their choice.

Use of 8-percent funds to supplement the technical institute's Title II-A program accomplishes many goals. First, it provides funding for additional support and counseling services required to retain JTPA clients in some of the highest quality skills training programs available in the area. Eight-percent funding also reimburses the technical institute for some of the paperwork costs associated with running an individual referral program. Finally, it hides the true cost of the program, helping the SDA to reach its performance targets. The Title II-A cost per placement figures would be much higher if all program costs came out of Title II-A funds.

Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center—Jonesboro

The Clayton County Work Rehabilitation Center (CCWRC) is a CBO affiliated with the Clayton City Public Schools. CCWRC provides vocational evaluation, remedial education, work adjustment, and customized vocational training for youth and adults with disabilities creating a barrier to employment. Referrals to the center come from the school district and the state DHR. Funding for programs comes from the DHR Division of Rehabilitation Services and JTPA Title II-A and 8-percent programs. Additionally, CCWRC has several contracts to provide clerical and janitorial services in local federal facilities.

CCWRC receives $70,000 in JTPA Title II-A funds for its Commercial Cleaning Training Program. This classroom training program serves mostly adults referred by DHR, and offers assessment, job readiness, work experience, and occupational skills training for forty clients each year. CCWRC operates another Title II-A program providing customized training. In-school and out-of-school youth are placed in OJT. CCWRC hires a job coach to provide additional training to the handicapped workers in the enclave. Presently, CCWRC has a large enclave at Eastern Airline's Sky Chefs food preparation facility at nearby Hartsfield Airport. JTPA pays for twenty-four supported work placements through this program. CCWRC also receives $26,000 in 8-percent funding for a job developer for these Title II-A programs. The job developer places graduates of the Commercial Cleaning Program in unsubsidized jobs and develops jobs for the customized training program.

CCWRC is not part of the local school system but they do have administrative ties to the school district. Besides administering the 8-percent funding, the Clayton County Board of Education provides CCWRC with a rent-free building and a special education instructor. School district students with disabilities are often referred to the center for two years of occupational and academic instruction. The school district and Georgia DHR were instrumental in getting CCWRC started in 1984.

The center uses funds from different sources to provide a comprehensive set of services. Graduates of the JTPA Commercial Cleaning Program can be placed at the center's job sites. Customized training participants who are not ready for jobs can be transferred to DHR funding, so as not to jeopardize revenues from the performance-based JTPA contract. In this way, JTPA becomes an additional source of funding for components in a comprehensive continuum of services offered by the CBO.

Conclusion

There is very little evidence of a major effort to coordinate vocational education and employment and training services on the state level in Georgia. The state's extensive vocational education programs are sharply divided between the secondary, postsecondary, and higher education delivery systems. The only education agency with any formal connection to the Georgia DOL and the employment and training system is DOE, and this connection is limited to the administration of the 8-percent program. Funding priorities are determined by local PICs, and 8-percent funds are generally used to supplement Title II-A

funding. The DTAE's technical institutes are most directly involved with JTPA and PEACH/JOBS services, and yet, until recently, they have not had anyone on staff in charge of coordinating JTPA programs.

This is not to suggest that coordinated programs and services cannot be found in Georgia, just that state policy is seldom responsible for it. The Georgia Computer Campus and the CCWRC do a fine job of combining multiple funding sources to provide comprehensive services. However, it must be noted that they do not receive Perkins or other vocational education funds, and that, instead, they supplement JTPA funding with vocational rehabilitation resources.

There are great plans for coordinating services offered through the PEACH/JOBS program. The creation of the multi-agency Family Support Act Committee, which initially drew up the JOBS plan, was an important first step. State leaders will have to push for the expansion of the employment and training system as the caseload grows. Already, case management is hampered by an inadequate MIS system that lacks access to the JTPA data. Only state-level coordination will solve this problem.

COORDINATION IN ILLINOIS

The Illinois case study illustrates coordination of vocational education and JTPA in a state with a large urban population centered almost solely in one city—Chicago—but with most of the state consisting of small rural counties. Illinois is a very political state, and in many instances, local coordination of job training services is dominated by local politics.

Illinois also represents an example of a state in which some of the service delivery areas (SDAs) are administered by local community college districts. On the surface, it would appear that this organizational arrangement should encourage coordination between the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and vocational education. It would be expected that staff at the community colleges would hold favorable attitudes about serving JTPA clients through educational institutions; however, this was not always the case. Strong and weak coordination was found in SDAs run by community colleges.

The Vocational Education System

The vocational education system in Illinois is administered by two agencies within the state government: the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) (714 high schools within 565 public school districts) and the Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) (fifty community colleges within thirty-nine districts). The Department of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education within the ISBE is the Perkins agency for the state.

About three years ago, the ISBE began to encourage the formation of Regional Vocational Delivery Systems (RVDSs). Sixty-one of these RVDSs have been established. Their goal is to improve accessibility and efficiency in vocational education for high school students. These RVDSs were instituted under the state's Education for Employment Initiative. Through the initiative, the business community has become more directly involved in the state's vocational education program. Commerce and industry have assisted regional system directors in defining new program and service needs, assisted in substantial curriculum revision at the state and regional levels, and offered summer experiences for vocational teachers participating in the state's Vocational Instruction Practicum.

The JTPA System

The Illinois State Department of Commerce and Community Affairs (DCCA) administers JTPA. There are twenty-six SDAs in the state, three of which are administered by the local community college districts. Initially, we expected coordination between JTPA and vocational education to be better in those SDAs administered by community colleges. However, this was not always the case. Much depended on how the SDA was structured. The specific way in which the Community College District administered JTPA varied dramatically from area to area.

The Welfare-to-Work System

Project Chance is the Illinois Department of Public Aid's workfare program. Project Chance generally requires all recipients who are healthy with no dependents under six years of age to register and participate. The program currently provides services to recipients of Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and General Assistance (GA). In addition, services are provided to food stamp recipients who are also receiving AFDC or GA. About one hundred and fifty thousand persons are now served by Project Chance—approximately eighty-five thousand are AFDC recipients and seventy thousand GA recipients.

Most Project Chance participants go into a job search program; however, about eighteen thousand enter some kind of education or training program. Much of this training is done through the community colleges. Community colleges can apply to the ISBE for special funds to run special programs for welfare clients such as literacy programs, adult basic education (ABE), vocational programs, and General Education Development (GED) programs. This money is combined with standard ADA (average daily attendance) received for each client. Project Chance will pay supportive services such as books, transportation, and child care for welfare clients in training.

Project Chance—like JTPA, job service, and vocational education—is a state-based program rather than a county-based program. During efforts to coordinate services at the county level, this lack of local control over Project Chance was at times seen as a problem. Local Project Chance representatives could not make local policy decisions, but had to defer to the state office for all policy. In some cases, this inflexibility and lack of

decision-making power at the local level got in the way of local planning of coordinated activities.

Eight-Percent Programs

DCCA contracts with the ISBE to administer seventy-five percent of the 8-percent funds and with the ICCB to administer the remaining twenty-five percent of the 8-percent funds.

Eight-percent programs funded by the ISBE include the following:

- *Early School Leaver Program*
  This program provides career education and employability skills training to JTPA-eligible high school dropouts, while enrolling these students in academic classes and providing part-time work experience.

- *Economic Development*
  Activities which support the governor's overall economic development efforts are funded with this set-aside. On-the-job training (OJT) and instructional programs are conducted for new employees at their place of employment or in public educational settings. Economically disadvantaged and JTPA Title III-eligible participants must be hired and placed on the payroll prior to the beginning of training. Programs are administered through a local education agency (LEA) in cooperation with the local SDA.

- *Education/Training Agreements*
  Each SDA is allocated funding to work with area vocational centers, community colleges, adult centers, local school districts, or other training providers to serve at-risk youth and adults needing a combination of basic and employability skills.

- *Illinois Pre-Employment Placement Program (IPREP)*
  This program assists high school seniors who have not taken a vocational or college bound program and who have experienced difficulty in finding employment to secure subsidized employment or postsecondary training before they graduate from high school.

- *Literacy Plus Initiative*

  This program has fifteen local projects focusing on reading, writing, math, and improvement of communication skills. The initiative creates partnerships between local basic education providers and SDAs who have identified participants that cannot qualify for vocational training due to limited literacy skills.

- *Public Housing Initiative*

  Local program coordinators work to establish partnerships between SDAs, educators, and public housing officials. Participants are usually placed in jobs at housing authority properties and attend classes conducted at eight of Illinois' public housing facilities.

- *Work Experience and Career Exploration Program (WECEP)*

  This program provides cooperative work experience and career-related classroom instruction for high school dropouts between the ages of fourteen and fifteen.

ICCB 8-percent programs include the following:

- *Comprehensive Adult Employment Development Projects (CAED)*

  This program funds projects developed by community college districts to provide training and employment assistance to economically disadvantaged persons in their districts. Community colleges may design a program to meet the particular needs of their district; consequently, projects vary from district to district.

- *Special Needs Adult Training Assistance Projects*

  This program provides funds, on a competitive basis, for the development of model projects that serve JTPA Title II-A special needs populations.

- *Procurement Assistance Center Projects*

  These grants are awarded to Illinois public community colleges for "Procurement Assistance Center Projects" that establish or expand contract procurement assistance activities to help area businesses seek government contracts. The program, which is co-administered by DCCA, provides procurement information, one-on-one counseling, and technical assistance to businesses.

- *Economic Opportunity Set-Aside*
  This program, which is offered in conjunction with the ISBE and DCCA, provides training funds to assist in the recruitment and expansion of industries in Illinois and to respond to other situations such as plant closings.

Other State-Level Coordination Activities

Governor Thompson has been very active in the implementation and continued operation of JTPA. The administrative agency for JTPA, DCCA, was created by the Governor's Office. Other agencies within the state government are also interested in coordination of social services. Several mechanisms for coordination have been implemented at the state level.

Coordination Agreements

All SDAs within the state must have formal coordination agreements between themselves and each education agency within their jurisdiction (including ABE and the RVDS), the local public aid office, and rehabilitative services. These agreements become part of the SDAs' two-year plans.

Quarterly Coordination Meetings

All SDAs are also required to hold quarterly coordination meetings with the service agencies within their jurisdiction. These meetings include the local community college district(s), the Department of Rehabilitative Services, the Department of Public Aid, The Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Employment Security (Job Service), and the Department of Aging. The meetings generally involved staff from each agency—not administrators.

There was a mixed evaluation of the effectiveness of these mandated coordination agreements and quarterly coordination meetings in fostering real coordination. Some people in the state felt that these agreements and meetings were more formalities than coordination efforts. Others, however, felt that these state mandates provide an opportunity for coordination to occur. When participants are willing to cooperate and see a need for better coordination, then these coordination agreements and meetings facilitate coordination. Many local staff felt that much coordination would not occur if the state did not require the SDAs to hold the meetings and draw up the agreements. At a minimum, the

meetings serve as information exchanges between staff members of different service agencies within the same jurisdiction.

State Occupational Information Coordinating Council

The Illinois State Occupational Information Coordinating Council (SOICC) has become active in providing occupational information as a part of the state's JTPA efforts. The Illinois SOICC is funded jointly by DCCA, the ISBE (through JTPA 8-percent funds), the Department of Rehabilitative Services, the Department of Employment Security, the Council on Vocational Education, the ICCB, the Board of Higher Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Public Aid. While providing current occupational information at the state level, the Illinois SOICC also produces county-level occupation and industry projections. These projections are available to local users on floppy disk. Users can request data aggregated up to any level: SDA, community college district, and so on.

Because of the structure of the SOICC, cooperation among the agencies involved in the SOICC is quite good. While each agency has an active interest in the work done by the SOICC, the actual work is done on contract to Eastern Illinois University. Therefore, the usual turf battles between agencies involved in SOICCs do not occur.

Pekin SDA and Illinois Central College

The SDA in Pekin serves four counties in central Illinois. Primarily a rural SDA, there is some light manufacturing in the area. There are two community colleges within the SDA, an area vocational school, several high schools, and several proprietary vocational schools.

One of the more interesting coordinated programs in the Pekin SDA is a set of programs run by the Illinois Central Community College. In five of the local high schoo. , the community college has a tutorial program for approximately eleven hundred students who are having attendance problems, are functioning two or more years below grade level, or who are exhibiting other indications of being at-risk of school failure. The program is funded through a combination of Perkins special needs, JTPA 8-percent, and Illinois State Alternative/Optional Education funds. Of course, the high school also gets ADA for each student in the program. The high schools hire the tutors for the program, but they are funded through the JTPA 8-percent portion of the community college program. Each tutor

serves several schools at the same time. Beyond the simple function of providing tutorial services, the tutors also serve as resource persons and advocates for "their" students.

In addition to providing the resources for the tutors inside the high schools, the community college also runs a basic skills lab on their own campus and operates an alternative high school for approximately sixty students at the community college. Estimates from the community college indicate that approximately ninety-seven percent of the students in the program stay in school until graduation.

Coordination of this program through the community college rather than the high schools makes good fiscal sense. None of the high schools served could afford to hire their own tutor, so coordination through the broader-based community college is a more efficient use of scarce resources.

Western Illinois SDA and Carl Sandburg Community College

The Western Illinois SDA is one of several SDAs in Illinois in which the JTPA grant recipient is the local community college. However, while Carl Sandburg Community College is the grant recipient for JTPA, it is not the sole administrative entity. Within the nine county area encompassed by the SDA, JTPA is administered in five counties by the community college and in four counties by the Two Rivers Regional Council. This somewhat unusual arrangement grew out of a split in local opinion over who should be in charge of JTPA when it was first implemented in this part of Illinois. This arrangement of having two separate administrative agencies was a compromise worked out at the local level.

The part of the SDA administered by the community college is also somewhat unusual in comparison with other community college-run SDAs in the state because the JTPA offices are not actually on the community college campus. In this sense, the JTPA program is run somewhat separately from other programs at the community college. However, staff at the JTPA office argue that there are still advantages to being administratively connected to the community college. Being inside the system, they have a better understanding of the problems faced by the community college and have more credibility with its administrators. It is thus easier to set up programs with the community college than it might be if the SDA were run through some other administrative group.

Vermilion County Job Training Partnership and Danville Area Community College

The Vermilion County Job Training Partnership represents another SDA in Illinois administered by the local community college. Danville Area Community College is both the grantee and the sole administrative agency for the SDA. In the beginning stages of the implementation of JTPA, it was the unanimous decision of the local private industry council (PIC) to have the community college be the JTPA grantee, and the PIC lobbied the community college to become involved in JTPA. According to staff at the community college, the SDA had always been interested in long-term programs for their clients and consider the community college the logical place for obtaining that training.

Unlike the JTPA office run by Carl Sandburg College, the JTPA office run by Danville Area Community College is on the community college campus. In fact, JTPA is a department within the community college administrative structure. According to staff, this facilitates better coordination of services not only within the community college, but also within secondary schools in the SDA. This occurs because the JTPA staff at Danville Area Community College are seen as "school people." JTPA and Danville Area Community College operate quite an impressive array of coordinated educational and work training programs and services. These include JTPA Title II-A funded programs in hospitality services, computer training, welding, machinist training, and also customized training for local businesses; Title II-B Summer Youth Programs enrolling youth in summer training programs at Danville Community College or at nine area program providers; and Title III dislocated worker programs. In implementing these programs, JTPA staff have taken advantage of the community college's good reputation with both the educational and business communities to provide a series of diversified programs for their clients.

One of the more dynamic programs funded by JTPA in this SDA is in the local high school. Using JTPA 8-percent funds from the state WECEP program, Danville High School runs a work-study program for fifty students, ages fourteen to fifteen years. Students are provided a part-time job with one of fifteen local employers, and the wages for these jobs are paid by private sector employers. Students benefit from the work experience and the extra wages, while the employers benefit by filling a perceived need for part-time employees during the day.

JTPA also partially pays for two counselor/teachers at the high school—eighty percent is paid by JTPA 8-percent funds and twenty percent is paid by the district.

Students have one class a day with the WECEP teacher and also receive one class credit for their work experience. In-class activities include employability skills, interview skills, and general life skills such as how to handle money. When students reach age sixteen and are no longer eligible for the WECEP program, a local JTPA Title II-A grant continues this type of program for them.

Macon and DeWitt Counties and Richland Community College

The SDA for Macon and DeWitt Counties represents yet another model of a community college's involvement in JTPA. While Richland Community College is neither the JTPA grantee nor the JTPA administrative entity, it still plays a large role in the administration of JTPA in the SDA. In part, this results from the community college's historical role in JTPA. In fact, until recently, the community college was the administrative agency for JTPA and was both the administrative entity and the grantee for JTPA Title III funds. Now, the SDA only subcontracts with the community college for specific services. These subcontracts pay for the cost of having two full-time employees at the community college.

One of the services the community college provides for the SDA is that it serves as a liaison between JTPA and the vocational education community. All clients who need vocational training are referred to the community college. The JTPA personnel at the community college then determine which vocational education institution in the community would best serve the client. Richland Community College also coordinates all of the ABE/GED programs for the SDA and runs an 8-percent GED program at the community college. Coordination between activities at the community college and JTPA are therefore quite good in this SDA, even though the SDA and the community college are separate entities.

COORDINATION IN MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts is an unusual case due to the high level of planning and policy direction that comes from the state level. This is especially true since a massive effort was initiated to consolidate and reorganize the state's expansive employment and training system. Over the past decade, Massachusetts has created a plethora of programs designed to complement existing federal vocational education and training efforts. When all the federal and state funds for employment-related training programs in the commonwealth are added up, the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) comprises just eleven percent of the total. One of those programs, Employment and Training Choices (ET Choices) has a budget nearly three times the size of JTPA. ET Choices targets the state's welfare recipients and has received international attention as an effective and innovative system that enables public assistance recipients to raise their family income and become economically self-sufficient. The commonwealth's effort to coordinate the expansive employment and training system may provide insightful lessons to other planners and program administrators.

Massachusetts is grappling with many of the issues faced by states throughout the country. State legislators are moving to consolidate administration of all employment-related programs, including secondary vocational education and adult basic education (ABE), into one mega-agency—the Department of Employment and Training (DET). They hope to develop a single system of programs and services accessible to workers and employers through a network of Opportunity Jobs Centers. A competing vision of the future is to strengthen existing partnerships and develop new ones among the many state agencies that administer employment-related training programs. The department heads and the Massachusetts Jobs Council, which are pushing this model, believe that higher quality programs result when agencies with expertise serving distinctly different client groups collaborate to develop an expansive system that meets the diverse needs of the state's workers and employers. The arguments that win out in Massachusetts may influence the direction other states choose to follow in the next decade.

To relieve existing and pending labor bottlenecks, the commonwealth has set the goal of creating a comprehensive service system for workers and employers with multiple points of entry. This "one system, many doors" concept is different from the model in states with comprehensive service centers. In the past, Massachusetts has developed targeted programs to address specific problems, including workplace literacy, dropout

prevention and school reform, regional development, mature industries, and welfare dependency. This, in part, is a result of a lively state political system centered in a major city within access of many interest groups. The growth of targeted programs has increased the need for coordination—a process begun over the last five years to transform what was becoming a vast array of discrete programs, each with its own points of entry, into the single system that has been envisioned. Currently, vocational education and employment and training programs are dispersed throughout many state departments and secretariats including the DET (Executive Office of Economic Affairs), Department of Education and Board of Regents (Executive Office of Educational Affairs), Department of Public Welfare (Executive Office of Human Services), and the Executive Office of Labor.

The most recent efforts to enhance coordination have been directed toward enabling local bodies to develop comprehensive plans covering all education and training programs in the local area. There has also been an effort to consolidate planning and administration on the state level. The most visible state level initiative to these ends has been the consolidation of the Division of Employment Security (the state's employment service and unemployment insurance administrators) and the Office of Training and Employment Policy (state administrators of JTPA) into the DET. Also important is the creation of the MassJobs Council (MJC) and the Regional Employment Boards (REBs), which are reconstituted versions of the State Job Training Coordinating Council and the Private Industry Councils (PICs), respectively. These two new bodies have increased government agency and labor participation and have additional review and approval powers over a wider range of employment and training programs.

With the creation of the REBs, all employment and training funds coming from state and federal sources flow down through the REBs and are distributed locally to create a comprehensive network of service. All local requests for funding must also flow up through the REBs. The state may continue consolidating the system at the top, at the state level.

Vocational Education Institutions

The State Board of Education is also designated as the vocational education board for federal funding purposes. It is advised by the Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education and staffed by the Massachusetts Department of Education (DOE). The Division of Occupational Education administers the distribution of federal Perkins

funds to two hundred and twenty-five occupational education facilities across the state, including fifteen community colleges, twenty-seven regional secondary vocational-technical schools, three county vocational-agricultural schools, and the local school districts.

The DOE has created six regional education centers to assist in the delivery of educational services. Regional Team Leaders for Occupational Education assist service providers in applying for federal funding and evaluating existing programs. They also facilitate communication between the Division of Occupational Education and the service providers. The community colleges are administered through the State Board of Regents of Higher Education, although they must apply to the Division of Occupational Education to receive Perkins funding.

Perkins Allocations

Most of the Perkins funds are allocated to secondary vocational programs in the high schools and regional vocational-technical schools through formula and Request for Proposal (RFP) allocations. The state has earmarked a portion of its 1989 Perkins allocation for special programs, which are matched by other state and local funds. A number of education agencies, teamed with local Boston-area community-based organizations (CBOs), have received Perkins funds for adult skills training under the Building Opportunities Project. Bay State Skills Corporation used its ET Choices funding to match Perkins funds for the state's mental health worker initiative. This program trains ET Choices participants for work in the mental health and mental retardation fields in which there are currently severe shortages of trained professionals. Ten community colleges throughout the state are currently participating in this program. In this way, the state has used Perkins funds to fund innovative programs that meet immediate and temporary training needs. State and local program administrators voiced apprehension over the current reauthorization process, fearing increased restrictions on Perkins funds such as stringent performance standards or restrictive targeting of funds.

The Community College System.

Community colleges in Massachusetts are fairly autonomous, each with their own Board of Trustees that establishes policy determining academic offerings. Staffing at the State Board of Regents' office is limited. Each college receives a direct appropriation from the state legislature that is loosely based on college staffing levels. Full-time equivalent (FTE) or average daily attendance (ADA) levels do not directly figure into the determination

of the appropriation. The political clout of trustees or state representatives is a more critical factor. Tuition revenues are returned to the state legislature.

A state administrator admitted that there had been some problems with community colleges "double dipping" when running JTPA programs. Service delivery areas (SDAs) were occasionally charged with administration fees when under-enrolled courses were simply filled up with JTPA clients. Tuition fees charged to the SDA did not always find their way back to the state coffers. The administrator also expressed apprehension about the increased role of DET in the ET Choices program planning process. She feared financially strapped colleges would increasingly be forced to give in to REB pressure and develop shorter-term training programs of poor quality that "train people for jobs but not professions." Many colleges are developing short, fifteen-week certificate programs so that JTPA participants can qualify for Pell Grants (which can only be used for certificate or degree programs), potentially reducing the perceived value of a community college credential in the job market. Colleges may also be forced to divert academic program funding so that they can develop placement services, at which they have little experience, to compete for JTPA funds.

Community-Based Organizations (CBOs)

CBOs are a particularly important source of JTPA services, especially in Boston. CBOs provide the full range of basic and occupational education services including outreach, recruitment, English-as-a-Second Language (ESL), General Education Development (GED)/ABE, pre-employment and occupational skills training, and job search activities. Many Massachusetts SDAs are under political pressure to distribute JTPA funds evenly across urban neighborhoods—particularly in Boston—that are often divided racially as well. CBOs are visible, neighborhood-based organizations with expertise in reaching JTPA-eligible target groups. Many Boston CBOs have institutional experience running job training programs that pre-date JTPA, making it difficult for local education agencies (LEAs) to compete on the basis of training expertise. Action for Boston Community Development (ABCD), with offices in most Boston neighborhoods, has been running the city's summer youth program since JTPA started.

State-Level Coordinated Policy Development and Programs

Coordinating the System

Massachusetts sponsors a long list of targeted employment and training initiatives. Some of these programs are listed in Table 1 and are described in more detail in this section.

The system stretches across six executive offices and two education authorities, making state-level coordination of the system difficult. The state legislature, led by the Assistant Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, Kenneth Lemanski, has pushed for consolidation of the system into one large state agency—the DET. State agency administrators and other interest groups have opposed consolidation moves, favoring partnerships among state agencies to coordinate the administration of new and existing programs. Clearly visible political battle lines have been drawn over the supremacy of these competing models of state organization, resulting (at present) in a partial consolidation of the state job training bureaucracy.

In 1986, partially due to a leadership vacuum resulting from an inactive Job Training Coordinating Council, Governor Dukakis established the Commonwealth Employment Forum to define basic principles for effective employment policy in the state. Those principles, described in their 1986 report, included a call to simplify the system and put additional state resources into existing and new initiatives to make up for declining federal funding. The legislature was reluctant to appropriate additional funds to a system that appeared fragmented and duplicative, and pushed for increased coordination. To identify barriers to coordination, they called for the establishment of the Cabinet Level Education and Employment Coordinating Committee (CLEECC). In its January 1988 report, the CLEECC made three important recommendations that have since been instituted:

(1) Reconstitution of the Job Training Coordinating Council into the MassJobs Council, whose twenty-one members include representatives from nine state agencies, the state legislature, labor, local education, local employment and training, CBOs, two mayors, and four representatives from private business. The MJC has the responsibility of coordinating all employment-related training programs in the state, including vocational education.

(2) Creation of the Massachusetts Department of Employment and Training through the merger of the Division of Employment Security (employment service,

Table 1
Massachusetts State-Sponsored Employment and Training Programs

Program (FY89 budget)	Administrative Agency	Target Group	Services Offered
Bay State Skills Programs ($2.6 million)	Bay State Skills Corp. (quasi-public corporation)	employed, unemployed, dislocated workers, welfare recipients, displaced homemakers	50/50 Industry Responsive Matching Grants, entry-level training for welfare recipients with private sector match, displaced homemaker centers (25 statewide)
Building Opportunities (not presently funded)	Boston and Metro North SDAs	youth, minorities, women, disabled persons	outreach, recruitment, orientation to building trades, placement, and follow-up support
Commonwealth Futures ($3.3 million)	Governor's Office of Educational Affairs, Dept. of Education	at-risk youth, pregnant and parenting teens	locally-determined strategies to reduce drop-out rates in high schools, promote systemic school change, provide re-entry services
Employment and Training Choices ($97 million)	Dept. of Public Welfare	volunteer welfare recipients	occupational and basic skills training, job placement, ESL, and support services
Industrial Services ($14 million)	Executive Office of Labor, Department of Employment and Training	dislocated workers, assistance to mature industries	re-employment services for dislocated workers, extended health and unemployment insurance coverage, capital fund to assist troubled firms
MassJobs Southeast ($450,000)	MassJobs SE Commission	all existing and potential employers and workers in	regional development policy, including customized training and other economic
MassJobs West ($250,000)	MassJobs W Commission	the development regions	development/job creation services
Workplace Literacy ($675,000)	Executive Office of Labor, Dept. of Employment and Training, Dept. of Educ.	all dropouts, functionally illiterate, and non-English speaking workers	ABE, GED, and ESL services
Young Parents Initiative ($2.5 million)	Dept. of Public Welfare Dept. of Employment and Training	economically disadvantaged pregnant and parenting youth, inc. AFDC recipients	survival, parenting, academic, independent living skills training; vocational and support services

unemployment insurance) and the Office of Training and Employment Policy (JTPA). The merger is designed to allow employment offices to offer a more comprehensive set of services to workers and employers.

(3) Reconstitute PICs as REBs (with the addition of educators, human services, and labor representatives), having review and recommend or review and approval powers over all employment-related training and education in the SDA.

The MassJobs Council (MJC)

In November 1988, the MJC submitted a long-term strategic plan to the state legislature with recommendations for consolidating and streamlining programs. Because nine of the twenty-one council members were representatives of state agencies, it was not surprising that the group opposed further consolidation of the system (but did not rule it out in the future). They did, however, outline the two competing models of state organization presently under discussion, framing the debate by listing the alleged strengths and weaknesses of each.

In the new consolidation model, the MJC would serve as the policy and advisory board to a single state agency administering all employment-related training and education programs. Proponents of this system assert it would reduce costs by eliminating program and administrative duplication. Clearer lines of authority and accountability would be established because decision making would be less complex if it were concentrated in one agency. Communication between clients and service deliverers would also be simplified because it would be easier for clients to get information about training options if they only needed to contact a single state agency.

An alternative model—the Partnership Model—is based on the assumption that a variety of local providers offers better access to clients with diverse needs, allowing programs to be targeted to specific groups and offering specialized services. Proponents of the Partnership Model claim it builds on the strengths of the existing system. The state already has a number of nationally recognized, successful, coordinated programs that may have to be dismantled and reorganized if consolidation occurs. The Partnership Model is said to offer higher quality programs, more responsive to the specific needs of target groups. In this system, each agency develops an expertise on issues important to a constituency group. Finally, proponents of the Partnership Model argue that consolidation

may not actually reduce costs or improve accountability, but obscure continuing problems within one huge bureaucracy.

The MJC has sanctioned the use of JTPA 8-percent funding for "seed" or "research and development" purposes. Eight-percent funding is administered by DET with the oversight of the MJC's Youth Coordinating Council subcommittee. Presently, the $1.8 million allocation is divided among three state-sponsored programs: the Young Parents Initiative, Commonwealth Futures, and Workplace Education. In each case, 8-percent funds are used to supplement funding from state and other sources.

Youth Coordinating Council (YCC)

State-level coordination of youth programs has a longer and more stable history under the direction of the state's YCC established in 1984. The YCC is composed of high-ranking representatives of youth services agencies, private industry, and CBOs. The year it was established it became a committee of the State Job Training Coordinating Council and was responsible for allocating 8-percent funds that, at the time, were used exclusively for youth services. Subsequently, the YCC has become responsible for reviewing the State Vocational Education Plan and coordinating youth services at the state and local level. In 1986, it successfully applied for funding from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation to establish Commonwealth Futures and presently the YCC oversees the program. Since the establishment of the MJC, the YCC has been retained as a youth subcommittee charged with setting state policy for services to at-risk youth.

Massachusetts State Council on Vocational Education (MSCVE)

The MSCVE has not been especially active on issues relating to coordination with JTPA, especially now that the MJC has been established to provide leadership in this area. Instead, the MSCVE has focused on articulation agreements between the state's community colleges and regional vocational-technical schools. Recently, however, the MSCVE released a report on JTPA/vocational education coordination, providing case study evidence of how local factors affect coordination at the local level. The report identified state-level issues from the case study evidence, including a clear definition of the goals of coordination and an acknowledgement of the divergent, self-perceived missions of vocational education and employment and training institutions.

ET Choices: Welfare-to-Work

The largest and most comprehensive state-sponsored employment and training program in the commonwealth is the Department of Public Welfare's (DPW) welfare-to-work program—ET Choices. The program was allocated $46 million in Fiscal Year 1989 (FY89), including state appropriations, federal Work Incentive (WIN) demonstration funds, and food stamp employment-training program funds. ET Choices is a comprehensive program, offering job placement, skills training, education, career planning, supported work, child care, extended health care, and transportation services.

The program uses the JTPA system to plan and deliver services to the ET Choices participants, who may be jointly enrolled. All ET Choices skills training and adult literacy/education services are contracted to the DET; therefore, funding to the SDAs can be combined. Bay State Skills Corporation (BSSC) also received DPW funds for skills training in non-traditional, high-wage occupations and for services to displaced homemakers. Separate from the ET Choices training funds is the state-sponsored Voucher Day Care program, which has surpassed the training program in total expenditures. More than $53 million in additional state funds were used to provide day care vouchers for approximately ninety-four hundred ET Choices participants during training and the first year of unsubsidized employment. A Title XX, state-sponsored, Department of Social Services program for low- and moderate-income workers is expected to be available for ET Choices graduates when the DPW subsidies expire.

ET Choices participants may enroll in degree or certificate programs if they are able to secure their own funding through Pell Grants for tuition and other educational expenses. ET Choices provides support services to those students who choose this option. Otherwise, participants in need of occupational training are directed to JTPA or BSSC programs, which may or may not utilize LEAs to provide skills training services. Table 2 shows a breakdown of participants enrolled in the various training activities the program offers as of April 1989.

The extent of basic education services provided and the use of community colleges is of interest. Almost one-half of the program's participants are enrolled in ABE, GED, or ESL programs, indicating a low level of basic skills achievement. The community and state college system served more than one-fifth of all program participants in degree and certificate programs. The high number of participants enrolled in non-JTPA community college programs is due to the direct DPW referrals to community college programs

existing prior to FY89, and client self-placements. However, as the program becomes more reliant on the JTPA planning system and as REBs exert their control, it is likely that this service rate will decline in favor of short-term training. There is also dissatisfaction with community college services at the welfare department. A DPW official complained that participants enrolled in community college programs were dropping out after receiving their Pell Grants. Inadequate counseling and support resulted in too few students staying on to receive degrees or certificates.

The consolidation of all training and education funds (except BSSC training) into a single DET contract is new. DPW had contracts with individual community colleges and regional vocational-technical schools for targeted training programs prior to FY89. There was also a college voucher system that allowed welfare recipients to attend state schools. This voucher system has been scaled down to serve just those who do not qualify for Pell Grants, with the money going through DET instead of directly to the Board of Regents. The move to consolidate funding through DET was designed to streamline the employment and training system and apply JTPA performance criteria to the ET Choices training system. It also established the locus of program planning for welfare-to-work services at the local REBs.

Many of the community college programs have changed dramatically since their funding source has been moved from DPW to the local SDA. Increasingly, they are being pressured to develop shorter-term programs with increased emphasis on placement. Colleges that had developed feeder programs preparing welfare recipients for degree or certificate programs are finding it difficult to continue them under the new system (see Massasoit Community College).

Industrial Services and Workplace Education

The Executive Office of Labor (EOL), in conjunction with DET, administers two smaller employment and training programs: the Industrial Services and Workplace Education programs. Industrial Services includes the JTPA Title III dislocated workers program for training and placement of permanently laid off workers, state-funded extended health and unemployment benefits for dislocated workers, and a revolving state-funded capital fund to assist troubled firms on the brink of a major layoff or shutdown. Funding sources include JTPA Title III, the Massachusetts Re-Employment Assistance Program, federal Title III discretionary reserves, and foundation grants. Industrial Services also received substantial private in-kind contributions from firms participating in the training

Table 2

Massachusetts ET Choices Enrollment by Training Activity

April 1989

Training Activity	*Percent*
Basic education only	21.0
Skills training—JTPA*	20.4
Community College—non-JTPA	16.4
Job placement/search—DET	10.8
Skills training—BSSC*	9.9
GED only	8.0
ESL only	7.6
Other higher education	5.9

*Participants may be simultaneously enrolled in community college or higher education programs.

program. This year, unemployment and health benefits were supplemented by a state appropriation.

The Workplace Education program combines state EOL funds, DOE funds, and federal JTPA 8-percent funds to provide ABE, GED, and ESL services to workers, often at or through a vocational-technical school or community college. Employers participating in the program must bear an increasingly heavier burden of the program costs, starting from as low as a ten percent cash match in the third year to full funding by the sixth year. The "institutionalization" of each project, leading to full private sector funding, is a major goal of the program. State funds are designed to be used as seed money for private sector programs.

Commonwealth Futures

The Commonwealth Futures program is a state-sponsored effort to direct existing funds and resources to assist disadvantaged youth. The goal is to help broad-based, community teams plan and implement long-term strategies to help young people either stay in or re-enter school. The program focuses on at-risk youth, particularly those who have dropped out of school or are in danger of doing so, including pregnant and parenting youth. By providing communities with on-site technical assistance, Futures staff help local leaders develop a system of programs designed to create the permanent institutional change needed to retain youth in school. Money is made available to local school districts to try out new programs with the goal of fostering long-term systemic school change.

This statewide effort tapped a number of funding sources: JTPA 8-percent funds; state appropriation to the program; a McConnell Clark Foundation grant, and DOE Chapter 188 Dropout Prevention funds. (Chapter 188 is a special state fund authorized through the 1985 Education Reform Act to promote systemic school change as needed throughout the state.) In addition, local SDAs contribute Title II-A and II-B program funds to local Futures projects. Additional funding of services to pregnant and parenting youth is coordinated with the Futures program. Local communities apply for DPW Young Parents Initiative funds through the Commonwealth Futures planning system.

Each funding source has its own requirements regarding who can be served and how. One major problem was the use of JTPA funds, which is restricted to economically disadvantaged youth. Only a portion of youth in danger of dropping out of school are from economically disadvantaged families (although they are likely to become eligible for JTPA

services a few years after they have left school and have trouble finding steady, lucrative employment). To allow the state to use JTPA funds for services to all at-risk youth, regardless of family income, the state exercised its right under the act to redefine a "family" for eligibility purposes, claiming that *all at-risk youth were to be treated as a family of one*. The state developed a long list of criteria to define youth as "at-risk" that was to be used in determining whether they can be treated as a family of one for JTPA eligibility determination. Because at-risk youth have little personal income, this innovative solution circumvented a federal disincentive to use JTPA funds for this purpose.

The state designates local areas for participation in the program based on the local concentration of youth at-risk. Policy development on the state level is conducted by the Governor's Office of Educational Affairs and DOE, and overall coordination comes from the YCC, a subgroup of the MJC. So far, thirteen cities have begun planning and implementation of Commonwealth Futures programs. They have set up local Futures committees, which include representatives from business, schools, government, and human services organizations to develop local plans. These plans include individual applications for funds by each funding source and an integrated budget. The plans are reviewed by four JTPA 8-Percent Regional Education Centers and a state-level work group that makes adjustments to ensure funding for approved programs. Local program policy is coordinated by the executive boards to the local Futures committees, which include the mayor, superintendent, PIC chair, and a human services representative.

Some examples of activities outlined in local plans include developing a central clearinghouse for communitywide information and service referral (Chelsea); establishing a K-12 system of linked programs and services for youth (Lawrence); expanding community-based agency alternative programs that have public school credit-granting status (Boston); creating a multi-grade level, coordinated case management/service referral system and parent support groups (Pittsfield); instituting a ninth grade cluster program (Brockton); and developing a citywide management information system to track individual service plans and youth progress (Fall River). Programs like these help achieve the overall goal of using Commonwealth Futures funds to close administrative and program gaps.

Interagency Agreements

The DPW has a contract with DET to provide job placement, skills training, and adult education services to ET Choices participants. The FY89 contract calls for twelve thousand program participants to enter employment throughout the state. However, DPW

does not reimburse any placements DET makes in jobs paying less than $6.00 per hour. As of April 1989, DET had placed five thousand participants in unsubsidized employment, which was sixty-four percent of the target for that month. DPW anticipated DET would fall short of the twelve thousand placements planned for the year and was planning to use the unexpended training dollars for additional day care services in FY90. DET attributed poor performance to the placement wage requirement, claiming it was only attainable in the Boston Area, but not throughout the state. Nevertheless, DPW plans to raise the reimbursement placement wage to $7.00 per hour in FY90. DPW fears that the legislature will give the training funds directly to DET, eliminating the need for an interagency agreement and reducing the welfare department's ability to ensure quality services for its program participants. The Assistant Vice Chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, Ken Lemanski, stated he favored giving the money directly to DET (to save DPW administration costs), but there are no present plans to do this.

The DET has another interagency agreement with the DOE to use JTPA 8-percent funds to staff four DOE regional centers. These centers will be responsible for coordinating the administration of Chapter 188 Dropout Prevention and JTPA 8-percent grant requests under the Commonwealth Futures program. These 8-percent funded staff members will also provide technical assistance to Commonwealth Futures communities and will review and comment on local Futures program plans.

Local Coordination and Policy Development

Regional Employment Boards (REBs)

Section 105 of the FY89 state budget establishes REBs to "provide policy guidance and oversight for all training and placement programs and all employment-related educational programs within their jurisdiction," including ABE and vocational education. REBs are essentially PICs with expanded responsibilities and membership and are subject to MJC policies. They are the front-line planning bodies for all federal, state, and local employment and training programs, reviewing all local requests for funding. Each REB is responsible for developing a comprehensive local employment and training plan (including vocational education) that describes local goals and priorities and allocates available resources. The DET is responsible for assisting in the development of comprehensive local plans and provides each REB with $20,000 in technical assistance funds. All local requests for funding must be consistent with the plan.

REBs have review and approve or review and recommend powers over all programs in the employment and training continuum, including local ABE, vocational education, and community college programs (of eight to twenty weeks in duration). Because the REBs have only been fully certified since July 1989, it remains to be seen what impact they will have on local coordination. Nevertheless, many vocational educators expressed fear about losing control of their programs to the employment and training community who often have different goals concerning program outcomes. Vocational educators want the REB's role in their programs to be specifically delineated. They want to know, in advance, precisely what the local REB will be looking for when it reviews a vocational education program. They are also concerned about resources. With so many programs to review and approve and so little money to do it, there is concern that REBs will resort to "political backscratching"—agreements between members to support each other's programs or reject someone else's program simply because they lack the resources for systematic documentation and review.

Massasoit Community College

The level of coordination between Massasoit Community College (MCC) and the Brockton Area PIC (BAPIC) has declined, with the college running fewer JTPA programs than it did under the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA). Toward the end of the CETA period, BAPIC started its own skill center to provide remedial education, including ABE, GED, and ESL services. This was done to relieve an overloaded ABE system, but it also brought ABE programs in-house—services that had previously been contracted out to MCC. Since then, the BAPIC has emphasized short-term occupational skills programs that end in jobs, rather than more comprehensive career-oriented programs. MCC has been reluctant to tie funding of its programs to performance-based contracts that require successful placement of program participants for reimbursement. Instead, they have turned toward DPW and ET Choices in which the emphasis had been on long-term, career-oriented education.

One of the products of this collaboration was the creation of the MCC's Choices for Opportunity program, which was originally funded directly through a DPW contract. This was changed in FY89 with the DPW/MJC decision to channel ET Choices funding through DET and drop DPW direct contracts for services. Therefore, FY89 funding for the program came through BAPIC. Choices for Opportunity provides a wide range of

remedial and basic education services to ET Choices participants. Originally, the community college thought of Choices for Opportunity as a feeder program into its regular degree and certificate programs. As the PIC has become more involved in the ET Choices program, however, MCC has been under increasing pressure to transform it into a stand-alone program leading to unsubsidized employment.

The Choices for Opportunities program is a year-round open-entry/open-exit program for ET Choices registrants comprised of three service components: the One Step Ahead component offers citizenship training, literacy and communication skills (for those with limited English speaking ability), and life skills/interpersonal communications skills training; the GED/Remediation component is designed for participants without a high school diploma or those needing remediation to enter a community college program; and the college educational and vocational course component incorporates a number of regularly offered MCC courses into the program. In addition to these three training components, the program offers intensive counseling, assessment, and support group activities.

The future of the program is in doubt. The PIC finds the program expensive and they are troubled by the fact that program participants go through about twenty weeks of training and often have no job at the end to show for it. MCC has little interest in running a short-term training program to place Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) clients in entry-level jobs, so they are wary of radically changing the program. The FY89 contract with the PIC is performance-based and allows for four kinds of positive terminations: job placement, educational placement, skills training, and supported work (DPW-funded) placements. In FY90, the PIC plans to allow only job placements for positive termination credit, disallowing school enrollment terminations. This will effectively prevent the college from using the program to feed students into their regular degree programs. The college is seriously considering ending the program, especially because they will have to attain a $7.00 per hour placement wage in PY89 to get credit for job placements. MCC administrators believe the program has been successful and do not feel the new restrictions would improve the quality of service. They claim that follow-up data indicates eighty-three percent of program graduates are either working, attending a four year college, or both. Forty percent are working full-time with an average annual salary of $17,500. They do not see any benefit in changing what they consider to be an effective program.

Brockton Futures

Brockton was in the first group of cities to receive funding through the Commonwealth Futures program. The state program combines JTPA 8-percent funds, foundation money, state educational reform funds, and special futures appropriations to provide services to dropout, pregnant, and parenting teens throughout the state. Brockton combines additional funds to finance their programs, including city funds and Department of Social Services funds. In all, nine different funding sources are used to support the program.

Brockton Futures combines six different programs. The oldest program (which predates Commonwealth Futures) is Project Climb, an alternative junior high school program for at-risk youth that includes intensive student and family counseling, basic and occupational skills instruction, and work experience. Grade 9 Futures is a similar program for ninth graders, but unlike Project Climb, students remain in the regular school building and are clustered within the ninth grade class to receive instruction and counseling as a group. The Grads program provides academic instruction, day care, and other support services to pregnant and parenting teens. Grads students spend half their day at the high school and half at a special center where they receive individual tutoring and parenting instruction. The Mentors program offers informal teacher, business professional, and college student contact to junior high school and high school students in a one-on-one setting. Operation Reachout is a re-entry program that uses volunteers to call youth who have dropped out of school over the last three years and encourage them to receive counseling about existing training and education programs. Brockton Futures also offers college tour days at local colleges for high school juniors.

Brockton Futures has taken care to ensure that loss of a single funding source will not mean the end of a program. Each program has multiple funding sources, some of which are combined at the state level and then matched with additional local funds. However, this is made somewhat difficult by specific restrictions. For instance, JTPA 8-percent funds cannot be used for youth under the age of fourteen. This prevents single year repeaters from getting into the Project Climb program because they would not yet be fourteen years old. On the other hand, Chapter 188 funds must be used to promote systemic school change—a requirement that would encourage programs directed at junior high school students. In this respect, the two programs have contradictory restrictions making combined funding problematic.

The Brockton Futures Program is operated by a local Dropout Prevention Coordinating Council and is designated by the Commonwealth Futures program to run the program locally. The council includes representatives from public education, the business community, human services agencies, CBOs, and local government and contains an Executive Board and several subcommittees. Many members of the Coordinating Council served on the Project Climb and Chapter 188 Advisory Councils which pre-dated Brockton Futures and were combined to form the Coordinating Council. The Executive Board handles day-to-day operational decisions and is comprised of the mayor, school superintendent, BAPIC director, and Executive Office of Human Services designee (usually a local welfare office representative). The Coordinating Council is staffed by the Futures Manager who supervises the staff of each Futures program.

Bristol Community College

Bristol Community College (BCC) in Fall River has a long history of running employment and training programs that dates back to CETA. Presently, it has more JTPA-sponsored students than any other community college in the system, and this, according to the assistant dean of Continuing Education and Community Services, comes from a self-perceived mission to "fill the gaps in the JTPA system." With a very high teen pregnancy rate and a large Portuguese-speaking community requiring language training, the need for education and job training services in the community is great. To make matters worse, Fall. River has never shared in the economic boom of the region to the north, which helps explain why it has been targeted for state-sponsored regional development through the MassJobs Southeast program.

The BCC runs coordinated programs with the MassJobs SE program, operating customized training programs in a variety of industries in which skill upgrading is required to remain competitive in the international market. Those employer recruited trainees who are eligible for JTPA services receive training paid for through Title II-A, while training for the others comes out of MassJobs SE funds. BCC designs the course for the local business and makes an in-kind donation of the necessary equipment. MassJobs SE is billed by BCC for administrative overhead.

The community college also runs a number of remedial education programs with a variety of funding sources. JTPA clients are referred for ESL and ABE services through community college programs funded by the Gateway Cities program (state-funded

immigrant assistance), DOE, Executive Office of Community Development (public housing programs), and the Workplace Literacy program. JTPA participants needing GED preparation receive this service at BCC in a class funded with Title II-A funds. BCC has a FY89 contract to provide two hundred and five JTPA clients with GED services. They must have a seventh grade reading level to enter the program.

BCC's most successful and longest running JTPA program (which began under CETA) is its Business Office Technology (BOT) program for JTPA students with a GED or high school diploma. BCC has a fixed unit cost contract to provide typing, general business, and office procedures training to ninety JTPA clients in an open-entry, five-month program. As with all the programs the community college runs with SDA funding, a counselor is assigned to each class, and in the case of the BOT classes, the counselor doubles as a job developer.

Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical School

The Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical School (GLRVTS) is a vocational-technical high school serving four school districts. Students have the option in ninth grade of attending their local high school or, if they wish to learn a technical trade while in high school, the regional vo-tech. The vo-tech's dropout rate, at three percent, is one-tenth that of Lowell High School. In 1974, faced with a declining secondary school population and having just built a new state-of-the-art technical school, GLRVTS decided to begin training adults to better utilize the facility. Originally, CETA participants were trained along with regular school youth in daytime classes. These two groups were separated under JTPA, receiving instruction in special evening and weekend classes.

Currently, GLRVTS offers adult training in four high technology occupational areas, including business, computer, electronics, and drafting technology for students with a high school diploma or GED. Courses are offered in two intensive eighteen-week cycles. In addition to the $350 tuition charged to those who can afford it, the program received FY89 funding through JTPA Title II-A, ET Choices, and Perkins Vocational Education grants in PY88. Of the three hundred people served in the program, forty were JTPA clients and twenty-four were enrolled in ET Choices. The program director stated that he purposely overenrolls and overcharges (on a cost per student basis) the SDA to make sure he can meet the performance goals in the contract and receive the maximum funding available. This reduces the efficiency sought through performance-based contracting.

Because a large portion of the funding for the program is tied to performance and is not available until students have finished the program (and after all the expenses have been incurred), the program relies on Perkins funding to make up the difference. The director claimed that he depended on Perkins funding because it is not tied to performance and is available at the start of the program year. The Perkins funding allows for an affordable tuition level that is below the actual cost of instruction. The program has had good results: a ninety percent placement rate of program graduates with an average annual starting salary of $19,500.

Conclusion

Far-reaching and dramatic changes are currently underway in Massachusetts as legislators attempt to consolidate a comparatively immense employment and training system. The effort is based on the theory that consolidation of programs under one lead agency can standardize funding requirements and reduce administrative overhead. A centralized program planning and delivery system may also help make the system more accessible to employers and workers. On the other hand, different programs with separate funding streams may serve different populations with varying needs. In particular, administrators fear a blurring of the distinction between vocational education and employment and training programs. They feel that some JTPA and ET Choices clients are best served by longer-term vocational programs that train the client for a career instead of an entry-level job—an option they believe is becoming scarce. The threatened cancellation of the Massasoit Community College's ET Choices program illustrates the kind of cuts that may occur when the REB/PICs have control over welfare-to-work programs.

ET Choices is a program under siege, and the criticism aimed at DPW is trickling through the entire employment and training system, including vocational education. The program is a victim of its own success. Having already served the most job-ready clients successfully, DPW is now expected to continue to make progress with the same amount of money and the remaining client population, which has much more formidable barriers to employment. At the same time, the clients are requiring more intensive training services, DPW is consolidating their program services with the JTPA system, which emphasizes short-term training. These factors, combined with the rising placement wage requirements, mean that ET Choices is being asked to do much more with much less. So far, ET Choices

has been helped by DET through their interdepartmental service agreement. It remains to be seen how successful the new agency will be in managing these conflicting demands.

The newly constituted REBs are another unknown in the equation. Unless the new membership displays unusually high dedication, it will be difficult for the REBs to conduct detailed reviews of all the programs under their purview with the limited resources at their disposal. The level of control the REBs will be able to maintain over their programs, including those over which they have only review and recommend power, remains to be seen. Equally uncertain is the procedures they will adopt in reviewing the programs for their consistency with the local plan, especially under limited resource constraints.

Unlike many of the other states we have seen so far, Massachusetts has created a system dominated by state policy. Attempts have been made to create one system with universal access throughout the state, while simultaneously providing enough local control to make program services relevant to local conditions. The state has tried to develop a local planning process and local planning capabilities without dictating the content of the end product. The rest of the nation will no doubt remain attentive to the success of this effort.

COORDINATION IN MINNESOTA

Minnesota educational agencies coordinating with the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) include thirty-four postsecondary technical institutes, nineteen community colleges, seven state universities, the University of Minnesota, licensed private trade schools, and state-approved community-based organizations (CBOs), plus local school districts. The State Board of Vocational Technical Education (SBVTE) allocates vocational education funding and is responsible for education coordination with JTPA. At the state level, coordination efforts focus on federally mandated activities and the administration of the 8-Percent Education Coordination grants.

In recent years, both the Governor's Job Training Council and the Minnesota state legislature have put substantial emphasis on providing education and job training for the state's public assistance recipients. Since 1987, the Governor's Job Training Council has set aside the majority of 8-Percent Education Coordination funds to serve public assistance recipients. Substantial resources from both JTPA and vocational education support the state's welfare-to-work program for Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients.

State-Level JTPA-Vocational Education Coordination Efforts

The primary state-level coordination between JTPA and vocational education in Minnesota is compliance with the federal coordination mandates. The state agencies rely on the federal mandates to coordinate, and the general consensus is that the joint planning process required by JTPA and other federal programs eliminates potential problems such as unnecessary duplication of services.

State agencies tend to make the best possible use of the required review and approval processes. The Department of Jobs and Training (DJT) reviews all state plans for training-related programs, including job programs, welfare programs, and vocational education. The Minnesota State Council on Vocational Technical Education (MCOVE) is very active in policy and program improvement. MCOVE has completed two state reports on JTPA-Vocational Education coordination: the first concentrates on projects funded by the JTPA 8-percent program, and the second analyzes the findings of a survey of all service delivery area (SDA) administrators, private industry council (PIC) chairs, and technical institute directors.

The administration of the JTPA 8-Percent Education Coordination funds is the major coordination activity in Minnesota. For the SBVTE, the Cooperative Agreement, a contract with the State Job Training Office of DJT, is the way the education community stays informed about the activities of the JTPA agencies and participates in service delivery. Meetings and monitoring activities for the 8-percent grant provide a forum for the two state departments to work together.

Vocational Education Services for JTPA Title II-A

In Minnesota, PICs decide what kinds of agencies will receive training contracts. This means that, unlike some states' policies, Minnesota does not treat public education programs as the first source for vocational or remedial education. Nonetheless, JTPA makes extensive use of vocational education for classroom training in Minnesota. A 1988 MCOVE study indicates that ninety-two percent of PICs have contractual agreements with vocational education for programs, courses, or activities that serve clients.

Typically, SDAs have program operators (usually non-profit agencies) that refer JTPA clients to educational programs. The SDAs that participated in this case study refer clients to vocational institutions primarily for classroom training. Vocational schools conduct some assessment, but most assessment and job placement is done by the SDA.

JTPA clients enrolled in technical institutes or colleges have access to the assessment, counseling, English-as-a-Second Language (ESL), related instruction, vocational training, and job placement services available to all students. Although the technical institutes and colleges could provide complete service from intake to job placement, not all institutes provide complete services for JTPA. Each SDA has separate agreements with each of the local institutes, and in many cases one SDA will have a unique agreement with each institution accepting its clients.

In Minnesota, technical institutes and colleges receive state aid for JTPA clients placed in their programs, making JTPA a state-federal partnership. When JTPA pays for tuition at technical institutes, the state pays approximately seventy-five percent (through state education aid) and JTPA pays twenty-five percent. Because most JTPA clients are eligible for federal student financial aid, grant awards can reduce the cost to JTPA even more.

SBVTE tracks the enrollment, persistence, and placement of all JTPA clients in the technical institute system, revealing important information about the extent to which the technical institutes and JTPA depend upon each other, and about the performance of JTPA students at vocational schools. The statistics show that JTPA clients generally persist and complete at approximately the same rates as other students. Statewide, seventeen percent of technical institute students are JTPA clients. At individual institutions, the proportion of students who are JTPA clients ranges from five to forty-two percent.

Remedial education for JTPA clients occurs in many different educational institutions: secondary schools (approximately one-third), technical institutes (twenty-five percent), through specialized providers (twenty-one percent), and at Area Learning Centers—special state-funded schools targeted to the re-enrollment of high school dropouts (fourteen percent).

Eight-Percent Education Coordination Funds

State Education Coordination funds are administered by SBVTE in conjunction with the State Job Training Office (SJTO) of DJT. The Governor's Job Training Council sets general policy for the use of the education coordination set-aside. SBVTE and SJTO jointly plan for and monitor the 8-percent projects.

Minnesota's 8-percent funding totaled $1.5 million in 1988. Twenty percent of the 8-percent funds are retained by the SBVTE and the SJTO for administration and technical assistance. Sixty percent of the funding is distributed to the SDAs by formula for service to public assistance recipients, and twenty percent is set aside to fund Special Needs projects.

Eight-Percent Formula Funding

Sixty percent of the 8-Percent Education Coordination funding is allocated by formula to the seventeen SDAs in the state. In Minnesota, the governor has indicated that all of the participants served with these funds must be public assistance recipients. The 8-percent formula projects also must be operated in conjunction with an accredited educational agency such as a public school or college.

The seventeen SDAs use their 8-percent formula allocations to provide a variety of services to public assistance recipients. Most use the 8-percent grants to supplement other

public programs—by co-enrollment of clients in Title II-A, Project STRIDE, or state public training programs and by using the 8-percent grant to provide select services. A few SDAs use 8-percent funding specifically for prevocational training such as General Education Development (GED), basic skills, and ESL or for job search programs. Others fund support services, counseling, and placement from 8-percent funds. Still others use the funds to pay for tuition, books, and supplies.

Eight-Percent Special Needs Projects Funded Through Competitive Proposals

The remaining twenty percent of the 8-percent funding is awarded through a competitive proposal process for Special Needs projects. Educational agencies and SDAs jointly submit proposals for Special Needs grants. Many proposals include partnerships with community service and advocacy groups that will recruit special needs clients and provide special services for the 8-percent projects' clients. The 8-Percent Special Needs projects in PY88 served disabled, dropout, and at-risk youth, AFDC and other public assistant recipients, and limited-English proficient (LEP) AFDC recipients.

The state uses the 8-Percent Special Needs money as start-up funds for new projects. Generally, projects are funded for one or two years. Although some projects have received second grants, the second award is usually substantially lower than the first. The Special Needs grants have launched some outstanding projects, including the Brainerd School-to-Work Transition project, which was nationally recognized as the top consortium-based school-to-work transition project in 1987. No matter how successful, these projects must find support from foundations or other sources to continue operations.

Project STRIDE: Minnesota's Welfare-to-Work Program

Project STRIDE (Success Through Reaching Individual Development and Employment) is Minnesota's welfare-to-work program. Administration of the STRIDE program is an interagency effort, with leadership from the Department of Human Services and the DJT, the state JTPA agency. DJT has a contract to operate the job training portion of STRIDE. Like most state welfare-to-work programs, STRIDE relies on JTPA and public education to provide job training to AFDC clients.

STRIDE is the responsibility of local county social services offices, which use contracts to secure all kinds of job training and support services for their clients. In some

areas, the STRIDE programs have contracts with SDAs to administer all job-training related services for STRIDE. The SDAs, in turn, either provide services directly or enter into subcontracts with other service providers.

All AFDC clients must attend a STRIDE orientation, but other STRIDE activities are voluntary. For those who volunteer to participate, an assessment and Employability Development Plan (EDP) are completed. The assessment includes education, skills, ability to secure and retain a job, and needs for supportive services. EDPs include setting goals and developing a timetable for completion of education and employment goals. All case management clients have contracts with the agency that specify the clients' service plan and the conditions under which the county will withdraw services.

The state STRIDE legislation requires each county to operate an employment search program for all principal wage earners in AFDC-Unemployed Parent households. All non-exempt principal wage earners must participate in job search programs, and other clients may volunteer for job search. Other employment training programs offered by some counties are grant diversions, community work experience programs, and on-the-job training (OJT). All parents under the age of twenty without a high school diploma or GED certificate must enter a high school completion or equivalent program.

The state has had to modify its welfare-to-work program to ensure that it is eligible for funding under the new federal Family Support Act of 1988, which provides matching funds for state welfare-to-work programs. The training program created by the Family Support Act, called Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS), is very similar to Minnesota's STRIDE program. The Minnesota state legislature has made minor modifications to the STRIDE program that will give Minnesota access to JOBS funds in the 1989 program year.

The Minnesota Technical Institute System is involved with the STRIDE program as a provider of education and training. While the specific number of STRIDE program participants enrolled in the technical institutes is not available, the Technical Institute System knows that many individuals enrolled in STRIDE have come to the technical institutes for assistance in training, job search, and placement.

Rural Minnesota CEP

The Rural Minnesota CEP (Concentrated Employment Program) is a private non-profit corporation that administers JTPA in nineteen rural counties north of the Twin Cities Area. Like most rural areas, the CEP has relatively high unemployment and poverty, and many dislocated farmers and displaced homemakers. CEP service delivery and project administration is managed from five CEP offices; and a total of nine local service offices, staffed with counselors, job developers, and other professionals, serve CEP clients.

This case study describes the CEP service area office in Brainerd, approximately one hundred and thirty miles northwest of the Twin Cities. The Brainerd office serves a five-county area and is the site of an award-winning 8-Percent Special Needs project for handicapped youth. The CEP uses its 8-percent formula funds to support public assistance clients in vocational eduction. CEP also manages the STRIDE program for the social services departments of nineteen counties.

Throughout the CEP, JTPA offices work with high school districts, adult basic education (ABE), secondary alternative schools, technical institutes, and community colleges, placing clients where their needs can best be met. The geography of the CEP lends itself to good coordination among education, JTPA, and other agencies such as rehabilitation and welfare services. CEP residents live in many relatively isolated small communities. Because each community's resources are limited and transportation between communities is expensive, it is most efficient to deliver services through existing agencies and schools.

Eight-Percent Special Project: School-to-Work Transition

In 1987, the Rural Minnesota CEP School-to-Work Transition project was nationally recognized as the top consortium-based school-to-work transition program in the country by the J. M. Foundation. The goal of the Rural Minnesota CEP School-to-Work Transition project is to assist handicapped high school youth to overcome barriers to employment. Youth participate in structured career planning, job search exercises, and work experience activities. The project has received JTPA 8-Percent Special Needs grants and JTPA Title II–A since its inception in 1985; although the proportion of funding coming from Title II-A has increased over the years as the 8-Percent Special Needs grants have declined. As a result of cuts last year in 8-Percent Special Needs funds, the CEP plans to cut enrollment in half.

The program is a coordinated effort of the CEP, the state vocational rehabilitation agency, special education, and vocational education. The 8-percent grant pays the salary of a part-time coordinator who counsels students, brings together the resources of the other agencies, and handles the administrative duties. Career planning, transportation and supportive services, and job search assistance are also covered by the 8-percent grant. Eight-percent funds are combined with Title II-A to pay the wages of students for part-time employment during their senior year. During the summer, youth work in jobs and are paid by the Minnesota Youth Program, a state fund for disadvantaged youth. Other support for the project comes from the Department of Rehabilitation and the local school districts, which pay the work experience coordinator or special needs instructors.

The Transition Program services begin with a meeting between the student, his parents, and the professional team that will work with him throughout the year. The team members consist of a counselor from rehabilitation services, a work experience coordinator or a special education instructor from the school, and the Transition Program coordinator from the CEP. During the first meeting, this group identifies the student's occupational and educational goals. An EDP describes the agreed-upon objectives, the services to be provided, and a schedule for meeting the goals. Next, the students attend a CEP-designed, three-day career planning course that covers decision making, values, goal setting, aptitude and abilities, and information about careers.

Each student is then placed in a closely supervised summer job that is compatible with his EDP and Career Plan. Most jobs are in public sector or not-for-profit organizations. During the summer jobs, students learn employability competencies such as how to apply for a job and employers' expectations for behavior; they also develop basic occupational skills.

At the end of the summer, the counseling team evaluates each student's employability competencies and performance on his job. The team uses this information to identify any skills on the student's EDP that remain to be mastered, and develops a new EDP. Then the student continues to work up to ten hours per week during his senior year. During this placement, the student is expected to correct any problems identified during the summer.

Near the end of the school year, the student's competencies are again evaluated. At this point, the students have several alternatives, including a full-time unsubsidized job, a postsecondary program, or further education and job training through the CEP. Whatever

the choice, the CEP project coordinator continues to track the participant. Several months after the client leaves the program, the team meets again, and they may recommend further JTPA or vocational rehabilitation services at that time.

Eight-Percent Formula Allocation and Title II-A Vocational Training

The Rural Minnesota CEP uses its 8-percent coordination formula allocation to provide classroom vocational education for public assistance recipients. Participants are selected from the regular applicants to the CEP: those that show an interest in vocational training and who are on public assistance are enrolled as 8-percent clients. JTPA funding covers educational expenses or supportive services necessary for enrollment in an education program such as child care or transportation.

The Rural Minnesota CEP supports 8-percent allocation clients through one- and two-year occupational programs. Students are referred to occupational training programs in one of seven technical institutes, a community college, or an accredited private school. In the Brainerd area, almost all clients attend the technical institutes. Generally, the technical institutes are convenient and offer a wide variety of occupational programs. Fewer occupational programs are available at the community colleges—most college programs prepare students for transfer to four-year schools.

The CEP refers clients to the same institutions for Title II-A occupational training as for the 8-percent program. Technical institutes and specific occupational programs at the community colleges and universities (such as the registered nurse program) take referrals for occupational training under Title II-A. Remedial education and GED preparation under Title II-A is generally performed by high schools and the Area Education Center, which is operated by the secondary schools.

Coordination with STRIDE

STRIDE started operation in the Rural Minnesota CEP in August of 1988. Approximately twenty to thirty percent of AFDC clients attending STRIDE orientations in the CEP area volunteer to participate. The education, employment, and training network in the CEP area also serves many AFDC applicants who are not enrolled through the STRIDE program. The 8-percent formula allocation, for example, helps approximately seventy AFDC recipients with education expenses.

The CEP administers the STRIDE employment and training program and provides services to STRIDE case management clients for all nineteen counties in its area. The

STRIDE funds flow from the state to county social services departments, which use the CEP as their certified service provider.

The STRIDE program has two major divisions: case management and employment training. Case management provides intensive counseling and life-skills training for the clients with the most barriers to employment. Employment training services are available both to clients in case management and other volunteers.

The CEP offices conduct STRIDE orientation sessions at local schools and technical institutes. After orientation, those AFDC clients who volunteer to participate in STRIDE meet individually with counselors. The counselors either assign a client to case management services or develop a plan for her education, training, and employment.

The case management services start with an assessment of the client's needs. Case management addresses all the issues affecting a client's ability to be self-sufficient—child care, high school graduation or equivalency training, personal relationships, mental health, physical health, housing, and parenting. These are fundamentally prevocational training and support needs: few clients begin employment preparation during the first year of case management. After receiving support services from STRIDE and community organizations, clients leave case management to participate in employment and training services.

STRIDE clients participate in employment and training services that address their individual needs. For example, a client with up-to-date job skills might use the Job Service for job placement. Others participate in career planning or an organized job search program. Those who lack sufficient occupational skills to find employment might be referred to classroom training. Although the law allows STRIDE to pay for classroom occupational training, the CEP has found that the other employment and training services use up most of the STRIDE training budget. Because classroom training is more expensive than other employment services, CEP uses the JTPA Title II-A program to pay for STRIDE clients' classroom training.

Dakota County

The SDA in Dakota County is an office within the county government. In an effort to consolidate employment and training services in the county, the SDA administration was placed in the Human Services Division in 1986. Social Service and Employment/Economic Assistance (income support) are also units of the county Human Services Division. This administrative organization allows the PIC to review the entire welfare and employment training budget, not just JTPA, helping to ensure that the services complement each other.

In 1988, the county SDA administrators and the PIC decided to contract out JTPA and the other training programs operated by the county. The contract was offered through a competitive proposal process, and the Dakota County Technical Institute won the competition. The Dakota County Employment and Training Center (DCETC), established at the technical institute for this contract, now operates all JTPA 8-percent, Title II-A, and 6-percent incentive grant programs, as well as wage subsidies for disadvantaged workers, employment training for food stamp and general assistance recipients, STRIDE case management and employment and training services, and a dislocated worker project.

The Dakota County Employment and Training Center (DCETC)

The DCETC has been in operation for approximately one year. Its existence has freed the county office of a substantial amount of program administration. The center is located on campus near other campus supportive service offices. The DCETC's location on the technical institute campus, with no rent charged to the county, also helps keep costs down.

The DCETC has developed into a one-stop training and education agency. Through the center, clients have access to state and federally supported job training programs, welfare, subsidized child care, education, and the services available from the technical institute. A Job Service counselor paid by DCETC is at the center full-time, and clients have access to a Job Service on-line job listing system that matches applicants to jobs. The technical institute's assessment center is located right next door to the DCETC and provides literacy, vocational skills, interest, and aptitude assessment for DCETC clients. The technical institute provides these assessment services at no cost to the county. All DCETC clients have access to GED preparation and testing through the technical institute's student services. DCETC also works very closely with the student financial aid office to get the maximum amount of financial aid for DCETC clients.

Title II-A and Other General Training Services

DCETC clients follow one of two general tracks, depending on their interests and abilities. Some clients are interested in and ready for immediate job placement and others are interested in education and training. If a client wants immediate job placement, DCETC will assess their work maturity, vocational, and literacy skills. These clients may receive employability skills training, counseling, and support in their job searches. Clients interested in classroom training participate in assessments aimed at identifying any remedial education needs, occupational skills, and interests.

DCETC clients may enroll in a variety of educational services. Remedial and basic skills options include ABE services for GED preparation and technical institute remediation programs associated with specific occupational programs. Clients enroll in the technical institute system, private vocational programs, community colleges, and university courses for a variety of vocational training options for up to two years.

When DCETC clients are referred to the technical institute or other vocational programs, they must apply for financial aid; then JTPA pays the costs (tuition, fees, and books) that exceed the financial aid grants. Child care is generally paid for by the STRIDE program for AFDC clients, and some JTPA funds are available for other child care.

Eight-Percent Coordination Formula Allocation

The DCETC operates Dakota County's 8-percent formula allocation training. Like many SDAs in Minnesota, DCETC uses the 8-percent allocation as one more source of training money for its general pool of clients. The 8-percent allocation is used to enhance Title II-A for clients with special needs, usually substantial remedial education and long-term vocational training. The target is single parents on AFDC needing long-term training.

DCETC enrolls AFDC recipients who show interest in classroom training in the 8-percent program. Even though the DCETC is located at the technical institute, clients are referred to a variety of private and public institutions for training. Generally, students enroll in schools that offer tuition-free or reduced cost training because the lower tuition increases the number of clients DCETC can serve. Because the technical institute is state-funded, it is one of the lower cost options available to DCETC. Some community college programs, especially in clerical occupations, also train JTPA and PATH students.

Project Discover

Project Discover, pioneered by Anoka Technical Institute, is available at the Dakota County Technical Institute. Project Discover is a course in self-sufficiency skills, career exploration, and financial planning. Students assess alternative careers and analyze the impact of entering each of the careers on the financial needs of their families. At Dakota County, Project Discover was not funded by JTPA. Up until this year, Student Services used a Perkins grant to offer Project Discover free to students. This year, Perkins funds are no longer available, but the project has continued by charging tuition.

The DCETC has taken advantage of Project Discover to serve its clients, especially those supported by JTPA 8-percent allocation funds. The goals of the 8-percent program and Project Discover are virtually the same: to help single heads of households prepare to support their families by working in non-traditional occupations paying high salaries. Project Discover provides assessment and counseling to encourage women to pursue training in non-traditional fields, while Dakota County's 8-percent funds are used to support women that choose to enroll in such training.

DACOT—8-Percent Special Project

In 1988, Dakota County received one of the largest 8-Percent Special Needs Project grants from the state for its DACOT training program. DACOT, or Dakota Clerical Office Training, is a special office occupations program for single heads of households. All participants are AFDC recipients.

The curriculum was designed by the Dakota County Technical Institute. The full program lasts two years; however, students entering the program with office skills skip the parts of the curriculum at which they are already competent. Those with advanced office skills may graduate into medical records technology or word processing specialist programs. Services in the DACOT project include self-esteem workshops and job search skills training. The 8-percent grant also subsidizes child care, an important program component. A community action agency provides more child care, plus transportation and clothing assistance.

Coordination with STRIDE

The STRIDE program in Dakota County is a joint effort of the Human Services Division and DCETC. Case management services are conducted by the Employment and Training Center. The placement of STRIDE case management within the DCETC allows

the PIC to review local STRIDE policy and assess alternative AFDC employment training strategies in the context of overall employment development strategies.

The Employment and Training Center and the Employment and Economic Assistance staff hold joint staff and planning meetings. DCETC recruits AFDC clients directly from STRIDE orientations. STRIDE participants enrolling at DCETC have access to all the DCETC services for which they meet the federal or state eligibility requirements. Through STRIDE, a STRIDE client receives case management, counseling, job search, and placement assistance, and is eligible for support in up to four years of education or training.

Anoka County

Anoka County Job Training Center is a county department that serves as the SDA for a suburban and rural residential area just north of Minneapolis. The SDA administration provides client services, including all its own intake, counseling, and OJT contracts. In addition to JTPA, the Job Training Center operates STRIDE for social services as well as state programs including MEED and the Minnesota Youth Program.

The predominant coordinated activities between the Anoka County Job Training Center and vocational education are the 8-percent projects and the referral of JTPA clients to the technical institute for occupational training. For 1988-89, the Anoka Technical Institute was the recipient of an 8-Percent Special Needs grant to provide occupational training in non-traditional fields for single heads of households receiving AFDC. The 8-Percent Special Needs grant for 1989-90 will support specialized training in a classroom program to encourage and prepare women to train for non-traditional careers.

JTPA Referrals to Vocational Education

Like many other Minnesota SDAs, the Anoka County Job Training Center meets each client's needs by drawing on the variety of programs available. The county will only fund AFDC recipients—enrolled under either STRIDE or JTPA—through vocational education programs, which limits referrals to vocational schools. When clients are referred to occupational programs, the SDA emphasizes training in relatively long-term programs (usually two-year programs). Referrals are made to a variety of pre-existing public and private programs that can qualify students for student financial aid. Financial aid usually covers most direct school costs, making it possible for the SDA to enroll clients in long-term training.

Approximately thirty-five percent of the SDA's classroom training clients attend Anoka Technical Institute. Because of the SDA's proximity to the Twin Cities area, there are four additional community colleges and four additional technical institutes within twenty miles, so the SDA also refers clients to these schools. The university also has a few two-year programs in science and technology, and community colleges have business and engineering programs to which the SDA makes referrals.

The Anoka County Job Training Center provides only limited programs in secondary schools. The JTPA summer youth and high school dropout programs are operated from the SDA office. JTPA clients are sometimes referred to ABE at one of the seven secondary school districts in the SDA, and JTPA covers some of the costs of these services. The SDA pays for supportive services for clients attending a GED preparation course at the technical institute or a GED program offered by a consortium of school districts, which is funded from the consortium's federal ABE grants.

Project Discover at Anoka-Technical Institute

Project Discover, pioneered at Anoka, is a prevocational program to help women enter non-traditional careers. The project was started with a JTPA 8-Percent Special Needs grant and a vocational education grant. For the past three years, the project was supported by vocational education funds. This funding will probably not be available next year. The Anoka Technical Institute will continue the project, however, by charging approximately $200 for tuition.

Project Discover is an eight-week program that serves low income, single parent homemakers considering technical/non-traditional occupational training. Classes help women choose the right career and prepare them to be successful students by helping them with math, communications, and study skills. During the eight weeks, the students realistically explore their career and educational options and address the barriers that often impede the success of single mothers in school. At the end of the program, most graduates enroll in postsecondary programs to prepare for jobs in fields such as electronics, construction trades, and architectural drafting. Graduates enroll in technical programs at state technical institutes, community colleges, and four-year universities.

Unique features of this program are group visits to campuses and industries, individual visits to classes at occupational schools, and informational interviews with employers and workers from industry. Each participant completes a financial analysis to identify how much she must earn after graduation to net the same amount of money she

receives on public assistance. She must then identify a training program whose graduates' average starting salary is at least as high as the wage she needs to remain off public assistance.

Because of the success of Project Discover, several technical institutes started similar programs on their campuses. During 1987-88, Anoka Technical Institute developed a Project Discover curriculum and a handbook. In the fall of 1987, Anoka Project Discover staff offered inservice training to potential new program sites, and they continue to consult with schools that want to begin new programs. Some campuses fund the project with vocational education grants (displaced homemaker grants) and others have secured JTPA funds to support Project Discover.

Eight-Percent Special Needs Projects

For both the 1988 and 1989 program years, the Anoka County Job Training Center has targeted its 8-Percent Special Needs grants to AFDC recipients interested in entering non-traditional, well-paying careers. The 1988 project, the Non-Traditional Training Project, supports women through occupational education. The 1989 project will be similar to Project Discover because it will offer prevocational training and guidance intended to encourage women to choose non-traditional occupations.

The Non-Traditional Training project for 1988-89 was designed to provide intensive support services and education in non-traditional fields for approximately eight single mothers receiving AFDC. The 8-percent funding awarded this project is actually very low (only $7,240). It is a joint effort between the Job Training Center and Project Discover at Anoka Technical Institute, Alexandra House (a transitional housing project for victims of domestic violence), and Head Start. For those who participated in Project Discover, the 8-percent grant provides tuition and support services while they pursue the non-traditional career goals they set in Project Discover. Single mothers on AFDC referred from Alexandra House and Head Start receive personal and parenting support from these agencies, while their occupational skills training is supported by JTPA.

All participants are concurrently enrolled in JTPA Title II-A and receive student financial aid to cover educational expenses. The 8-percent grant is used exclusively for client transportation and tuition that is not covered by financial aid. JTPA Title II-A is used for vocational assessment, counseling, and job placement. Child care costs are paid by the county social services sliding-scale child care program, available to all low-income parents.

The SDA's proposal for the 1989-90 8-Percent Special Needs grant is to fund a project called Victory through Vocational Education Exploration (VVEE). This project will have the same cooperative partners—the technical institute, Alexandra House, and Head Start—but will support the prevocational training of AFDC recipients interested in non-traditional careers, rather than the occupational education itself. In doing so, the VVEE project will serve more women (twenty to thirty) than were served in 1988-89. The VVEE program will be an SDA version of Project Discover. Women will assess the minimum wage they need to be self-sufficient and explore career alternatives in non-traditional/technical fields that have average entry wages at least as high as those required to become self-sufficient.

For both of these 8-Percent Special Needs projects, the technical institute is a cooperative partner; however, unlike the arrangement in some other Minnesota Special Needs grants, Anoka Technical Institute is not primarily responsible for the training. Instead, Vocational Education has assisted the SDA by developing curriculum and providing referrals to the SDA programs. While the SDA's 8-percent programs encourage those interested in vocational education to pursue the training, this training is not necessarily at the technical institute.

The City of St. Paul

The SDA administration for the City of St. Paul is the Job Creation and Training Section (JCT) within the city Department of Planning and Economic Development, Division of Community Development. The city has contracts with private non-profit organizations such as the Urban League to operate most of the JTPA training projects in the SDA. (These agencies are called program operators.) Many of the program operators provide services from an Employment Center owned by the City of St. Paul.

This case study focuses on the relationship between the St. Paul JTC and the St. Paul Technical Institute. Approximately sixty percent of all St. Paul JTC clients who are in classroom training are enrolled at the technical institute. St. Paul Technical Institute is also the JTC's education partner for 8-Percent Special Needs grants.

JTPA Referrals to St. Paul Technical Institute

The St. Paul Technical Institute accepts referrals of JTPA clients for vocational training from the City of St. Paul and other SDAs. More than six hundred JTPA clients

attended the St. Paul Technical Institute in 1987, accounting for fifteen percent of the Technical Institute's students. The City of St. Paul sends approximately sixty percent of its JTPA clients that are in training to the technical institute. Approximately eighty JTPA clients of the St. Paul SDA attend the Technical Institute at any one time.

Eight-Percent Special Needs Project: Refugee Women's Special Services

St. Paul Technical Institute is participating in a JTPA project called the Refugee Women's Special Services Project (RWSS), operated with an 8-Percent Special Needs grant held by the City of St. Paul JTC. The RWSS's project is a cooperative effort of the technical institute, an independent school district, and two non-profit agencies. The project provides prevocational assessment and ESL training in conjunction with work experience, career exploration, and vocational training.

For 1988-89, the project recruited women from the growing St. Paul population of Hmong refugees from Laos. The goal of RWSS is to address the severe barriers to employment faced by these women, including limited-English language proficiency, limited survival skills, limited knowledge of child care and transportation resources, and little or no job skills or knowledge of American employment. In 1988-89, the project enrolled twenty-seven economically disadvantaged refugee AFDC mothers whose English language capability is very limited. Most of the women are married, and their husbands are AFDC-Unemployed clients of the STRIDE program who are in mandatory STRIDE program training. The project has received an 8-Percent Special Needs grant to continue providing prevocational services for the same women through the 1989-90 school year.

Each of the cooperative agencies has assumed a different responsibility for the training. The St. Paul JTC is the grant recipient, managing participant tracking, financial reporting, and eligibility verification. The Lao Family Community agency recruits and tracks the progress of participants, providing case management services, day care, transportation, assessment and counseling, and job placement with JTPA and STRIDE funding. The ABE division of the independent school district provides basic ESL training and survival skills training (e.g., how to make phone calls, how to use the bus system, and so on). At St. Paul Technical Institute, the women participate in vocational exploration courses and the specially developed occupational ESL curriculum that focuses on language skills for the workplace. The women will have up to two years to participate in the ESL and survival skills training.

During the first year of language and counseling services, the women have participated in hands-on work experience training. A non-profit agency called the Self-Potential Resource Center arranges these work experience placements. The agency has placed women in electronic assembly jobs and other occupations that do not require English language proficiency.

The women will pursue careers that do not require English language proficiency in such fields as occupational homemaking (cooking or housekeeping), electronics, nursing aide/practical nursing, and some graphic arts jobs. As their language and employability skills improve, some women will find jobs. Others will seek further vocational training at the technical institute. There are no special funds available for this further training; however, women choosing to pursue occupational training can get their tuition and expenses covered by student aid, and supportive services will be available through STRIDE and county social services.

Project Advance

Project Advance is a STRIDE project at the St. Paul Technical Institute that draws on the resources of JTPA. It was built on the Project Discover model of prevocational services for AFDC clients. The project serves long-term AFDC recipients who have multiple barriers to employment. During the two years for which the project is funded, approximately sixty women will participate.

The relationship between Project Advance and JTPA is similar to the relationship between STRIDE projects and JTPA throughout the state. Potential clients learn about Project Advance during the mandatory STRIDE orientations. Interested women meet with the Project Advance staff at St. Paul Technical Institute. A JTPA counselor certifies eligibility and need for child care and transportation assistance and authorizes county human services child care and transportation subsidies for women who enroll.

The majority of the fees for the Project Advance special classes and services are paid for by the STRIDE grant. The first group of women who were enrolled for the winter quarter applied for Pell grants that paid the instructional costs of the Project Advance courses. For the second quarter, JTPA Title II-A paid tuition to Project Advance for the new clients and paid for some of the additional services of the program such as field trips and special speakers. The JTPA funding of the Project Advance tuition will allow the women to save their Pell grants for their occupational training programs (Pell grants have a lifetime total maximum).

Project Advance is structured to prepare women to enter occupational programs and to provide support during vocational training and job search. The project has been organized into three distinct phases: Phase one lasts two academic quarters and addresses the prevocational training needs to overcome the multiple barriers to education and employment the clients face; Phase two involves support during occupational training; and Phase three addresses job readiness and job search training and provides support services for the first year of employment.

During the first phase, women attend a variety of prevocational classes at the technical institute. They enroll full time in a combination of regular vocational institute classes and special classes for Project Advance clients. The special Project Advance classes include an ongoing support group; personal development; career exploration and individualized career research leading to a decision of an occupational training program to pursue; ability, interest, and aptitude assessment; communication skills; and parenting classes. Also during this first quarter, women take classes to prepare for the GED test, remedial education courses, and prerequisite courses to prepare them for admission to their chosen postsecondary occupational programs. All clients in Project Advance are still in this phase of training.

During Phase two, Project Advance will provide ongoing support for the women enrolled in occupational training. The campus Women's Resource Center will sponsor the support services (continued child care and transportation support, academic support, and counseling), so that the supportive services can be available to all women at the technical institute as well as Project Advance. The women from Project Advance plan to enroll in vocational programs at the technical institute, the college, and the University of Minnesota.

The third phase will begin when the women complete their occupational training programs in two to four years. At that time, they will receive instruction and assistance in job search and work readiness skills. Once the women are placed in jobs, Project Advance staff will continue to ensure that necessary support services such as transportation and child care are available, and will continue to provide counseling and support as the women adjust to the new demands of working.

Eight-Percent Formula Allocation Funds

The City of St. Paul uses its 8-percent allocation to supplement the training funds available under regular JTPA titles to provide regular JTPA services to public assistance clients. The range of services include assessment, career planning, counseling, vocational

training, and job search assistance. The majority of the required one-to-one match is derived from state and federal postsecondary aid, and the rest of the match comes from OJT contributions. The 8-percent formula is allocated through the City's program operators who may refer the public assistance clients enrolled in JTPA to the technical institute, community college, or other vocational programs. They use the 8-percent funding to cover tuition, supplies, or supportive services.

STRIDE in St. Paul

The STRIDE program in St. Paul is administered, along with JTPA, by the Department of Planning and Economic Development. The city's approach to the STRIDE program has been to contract with non-profit organizations to deliver STRIDE services. At the time of our visit, the primary STRIDE contractor for St. Paul had just decided to give up its STRIDE contract. The technical institute reported that it was interested in taking over the services offered by this agency; however, the contracts were given to the Urban League and ABE in the St. Paul schools. Therefore, the only STRIDE training that St. Paul Technical Institute will conduct in the near future is the Project Advance training funded with the STRIDE special project grant.

Conclusion

In Minnesota, state policy regarding the coordination between JTPA and vocational education focuses on compliance with federally required coordination activities. The DJT conducts a thorough review of the state vocational education plan and the administration of the 8-percent education set-asides to encourage coordination between JTPA and vocational education. The SBVTE does its part to encourage cooperation by encouraging the state's technical institutes to pursue 8-percent coordination grants and by offering technical assistance to technical institutes interested in working with JTPA.

Local JTPA programs and educational institutions have cooperative training programs, and many examples of innovative cooperative ventures were observed at the four local programs described in this study. The motivation for these programs was primarily a desire to secure as many sources of funds as possible to aide the range of clients served by the programs. State and federal policy and programs had virtually no effect on the local programs' decisions to coordinate. The availability of the 8-Percent Special Needs

grants was the exception: this federal set-aside gave local education and JTPA programs impetus to work together in innovative ways.

The state-level concern with employment training for public assistance recipients has had a visible effect on JTPA, vocational education, and the coordination between the two programs. The most obvious effect is the dedication of the JTPA 8-percent formula funding to serve public assistance recipients. The training of AFDC clients has also become a priority in more subtle ways. Most of the Minnesota 8-Percent Special Needs grants (competitive proposals) target AFDC recipients. Innovative projects in the technical institutes such as Project Discover, VVEE, and Project Advance—some of which are funded by Perkins, some by JTPA, and some by both sources—are targeted to the prevocational needs and occupational training of welfare recipients. It will be interesting to see in the years to come the extent to which public education and JTPA resources are targeted specifically to clients of the welfare-to-work programs.

COORDINATION IN TENNESSEE

The Tennessee case study provides an example of some interesting state-level coordinated efforts and, like Illinois, is an example of a state in which many community colleges are Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) administrative agencies. A history of strong involvement by governors in this state has resulted both in the location of service delivery areas (SDAs) in the community colleges and in the primary JTPA-education relationships that exist between the community colleges and JTPA and the State Department of Education, Division of Adult and Community Education's literacy program and JTPA. The Department of Education's Division of Vocational-Technical Education, which is the primary recipient of federal Vocational Education funds, has a relatively limited state-level role in JTPA programs.

Vocational Education System

Secondary vocational education in Tennessee is the responsibility of the State Department of Education's Division of Vocational-Technical Education. The Department of Education oversees the public schools, including secondary vocational centers that are operated by local school districts. The Board of Regents in Tennessee, which receives only fifteen percent of the federal Vocational Education funds in the state, is responsible for all state institutions of higher education except the University of Tennessee. The Board of Regents' system includes thirteen community colleges and twenty-six postsecondary area vocational-technical schools.

Both the State Department of Education, Division of Adult and Community Services, and the Board of Regents receive JTPA 8-Percent Education Coordination funds. The Division of Vocational-Technical Education does not receive any 8-percent funding, but the administration appears interested in and well-informed about JTPA and works to keep local secondary schools apprised of the services available (e.g., through presentations at state vocational directors conferences). State Vocational Education funds support some JTPA school-to-work transition programs in the secondary schools; however, because state Vocational Education is not included in the JTPA 8-percent program, its ability to create joint Perkins-JTPA state-level programs is limited.

The JTPA System, Including SDAs in the Community Colleges

The state of Tennessee has an unusual relationship between its community colleges and JTPA: community colleges are the JTPA grant recipients and administrative entities in seven of the fourteen JTPA SDAs in the state. At the state level, JTPA is administered by the Employment and Training Division of the Tennessee Department of Labor. When SDAs were first established in 1983, it was the goal of the governor's office to have all SDAs housed in community colleges. The decision as to what organization would serve as the SDA administrative agency, however, belonged to the local elected officials of each area. The governor's office was successful in selling its concept of community college SDA administration to seven of the local areas. In Tennessee's remaining seven SDAs, the usual kinds of agencies (such as area development districts and local government units) administer JTPA.

The location of SDAs in colleges appears to have the most impact on SDA administration and image. The SDAs located at community colleges see a clear advantage to having a stable, respected institution as their administrative entity. The SDAs benefit from the professional services available to them such as the college accounting department and legal counsel. As part of the college, the SDA has an added level of legitimacy; for example, JTPA job developers can call on companies and introduce themselves as staff of the college, which is a far more visible institution than the private industry council (PIC) in most communities.

The location of SDA administration in community colleges does not appear to have an effect on the kind of services received by clients. As was true in Illinois, this organizational arrangement does not lead to increased use of classroom vocational education. The SDAs located at community colleges see their primary mission as job placement and are just as concerned about meeting their performance standards as other SDAs. Therefore, the college SDAs choose to refer clients to vocational education based on the needs of the individual and the resources available. Because longer-term training is relatively expensive (and not always feasible for the client), SDAs in colleges place students in a range of JTPA services. A review of state statistics showing the number of SDA referrals to vocational training revealed no difference between the tendency of college SDAs and other SDAs to place clients in classroom vocational skills training.

Eight-Percent Education Coordination Funds

In Tennessee, the governor has used the allocation of 8-Percent Education Coordination funds to support state priorities for education. At this time, the JTPA 8-percent funds are split evenly between the Board of Regents and the State Department of Education's Division of Adult and Community Education. For the first few years of JTPA, all of the 8-percent money was allocated to the Board of Regents for programs at the community colleges and area vocational-technical schools. Two years ago, one half of the 8-percent funds were redirected to the Division of Adult and Community Education to fund literacy programs.

The Division of Adult and Community Education programs

The Division of Adult and Community Education uses its 8-percent funds to support literacy training in forty-eight of Tennessee's ninety-six counties. These literacy training programs are available in all counties in the state. Literacy programs that are not supported by 8-percent funds are paid for with state funds or a grant from the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Regardless of the funding source, these literacy programs all offer literacy training at all levels up to General Education Development (GED) preparation. Their main target is the functionally illiterate or those reading below a fifth grade level. Each literacy site is staffed with a certified teacher, teaching assistant, and numerous volunteers. The JTPA-funded literacy programs have JTPA counselors available to help clients with job search or enrollment in other education and training programs once they complete their literacy goals.

The Department of Education's literacy training fills a need that is not met by JTPA. More than four thousand people were enrolled in the 8-percent literacy programs last year, and many more were served with state and Appalachian Regional Commission funds. The program can reach so many clients because it relies heavily on volunteer tutors working from churches, community organizations, and store front offices. The target population of the literacy program (those reading below the fifth grade level) is not a population that is usually served by regular JTPA programs, primarily because regular JTPA programs have to meet performance standards. JTPA offices do have their own remedial education programs; however, JTPA remedial education is aimed at brushing up basic skills to prepare clients for occupational skills training or employment.

An unfortunate result of these differences is that the 8-percent literacy program generally does not operate as an integrated part of JTPA. SDAs tend to view the Adult and Community Education literacy training as inappropriate for those seeking employment. Because it relies on volunteers, the literacy programs usually tutor clients a few hours a week, and it may take one year for a client to achieve a one-grade improvement in reading level. In contrast, JTPA remedial programs usually require a five-day per week commitment, so clients move quickly to employment activities. The SDAs do refer people with very low reading skills to the literacy program, but only when they are not seeking immediate employment. If an SDA has a client who needs remedial education prior to entering job training, it will generally use the SDA's own workplace literacy program, not the 8-percent program.

The Board of Regents' Programs

The Board of Regents' 8-percent money serves clients in all the SDAs. This half of the coordination funding provides education through cooperative agreements among the Board of Regents, community colleges, and the administrative entities in all SDAs in the state. These 8-percent funds are allocated to the SDAs to secure training through colleges. A community college that is also an SDA, therefore, would serve its own area's clients and might serve clients from a neighboring SDA under the 8-percent grant. The SDAs that are located at colleges are at an advantage in coordinating their 8-percent with other JTPA programs.

Clients enrolled in the Board of Regents' 8-percent programs receive assessment, occupational skills training at the college or vocational-technical institute, counseling, and employment preparation. The 8-percent programs are typically well-integrated with 78-percent services, and clients are co-enrolled or concurrently enrolled in 8-percent and 78-percent programs. Typically, co-enrolled clients attend occupational skills training courses and receive tuition assistance from one JTPA program and support services (such as child care assistance) from the other. Clients may be concurrently enrolled so that one program covers their remedial education and the other pays for occupational training or so that each program pays for one year of a two-year degree program. Most SDAs pay student expenses—tuition, fees, books, and required supplies—from the 8-percent grant.

Each college has an 8-percent JTPA counselor who counsels the students, assists them in securing Pell grants and other financial aid, and tracks their progress during their occupational programs. Students attending the community colleges use the array of

services available to college students, including health care, academic and career counseling, and job placement assistance. Most area vocational-technical schools also have JTPA counselors: approximately one-half of the counseling positions are funded with 8-percent funds and the other-half are funded from JTPA 78-percent funds.

Although the vast majority of those enrolled in the Board of Regents' 8-percent program are enrolled for occupational skills training at vocational-technical schools, community colleges, or vocational centers, many others receive basic skills or remedial instruction. Clients may attend programs at community-based organizations (CBOs) or other non-profit institutions if the college has subcontracts with such organizations.

In many SDAs, the 8-percent program is the primary source of funding for long-term (one- or two-year) occupational training. Even at the SDAs located within the community college system, concerns about meeting performance standards limit the number of clients the SDA is willing to support in classroom training. The Board of Regents' 8-percent program clearly has a positive impact on the amount of occupational skills training offered by JTPA in Tennessee.

Other State-level Coordination Efforts

STEP

STEP is the Summer Education and Training Program that, under the support and guidance of the Tennessee Department of Labor, is currently being piloted by five Tennessee SDAs. The program brings together the resources of the state JTPA 6-percent performance incentive grants, SDA summer youth programs, and secondary schools. The STEP program, including a specialized remedial education curriculum package, was designed specifically for use in JTPA youth programs by Public/Private Ventures (a private employment training institute in Philadelphia), and it is used by SDAs nationwide. The Tennessee Department of Labor retains Public/Private Ventures to implement STEP at the pilot sites.

STEP enrolls fourteen and fifteen year-old high school students who are at risk of dropping out of school. Participants, mostly students who are behind in their academic credits, are identified by the schools. The primary purpose of the program is to keep these youth in school by allowing them to catch up on high school credits and by reinforcing basic skills with work experience in public or not-for-profit sector employment. The

curriculum includes math, reading, and higher thinking skills. In addition, the program teaches survival skills and decision-making skills, with a specific emphasis on preventing teenage pregnancy.

During the summer, participants enroll in the Title II-B summer youth program: they attend remedial education classes in the morning and go to JTPA-subsidized work experience jobs in the afternoon. In the classroom, youth improve their basic skills through individualized study and learn decision-making and employability skills in group sessions. In the afternoon, small groups of youth work at specially developed jobs in which their supervisors purposefully assign tasks that use basic math and reading skills.

Upon completing the summer programs, STEP clients enroll in Title II-A and receive ongoing support and encouragement from mentors. These counselors check on the students' progress, encourage students to stay in school, and provide support such as tutoring or referral to health and community services. Occasional group activities such as picnics and ball games keep the youth interested and cohesive during the school year.

The education partners for this project were chosen by the participating SDAs. Most are high schools, but one vocational-technical school and a state university also host programs. JTPA tests students' basic skill levels and pays for the program teachers, student wage subsidies, and supportive services. The schools' contributions consist of facilities, equipment, software, and other in-kind services. The program makes use of classrooms, computers, and teachers that would otherwise not be used during the summer months.

Jobs for Tennessee Graduates and School-to-Work Transition Programs

Jobs for Tennessee Graduates (JTG) is a school-to-work transition program based on a national model. JTG is a JTPA-funded class available in six of Tennessee's fourteen SDAs, which enrolled over four thousand high school students last year. The program is a cooperative effort between JTPA, local education agencies, the State Department of Labor, and the State Department of Education.

The JTG curriculum is aimed at preparing youth to move from high school to employment. The curriculum includes career exploration, pre-employment skills, and appropriate work behaviors. The Tennessee Department of Labor and the State Department of Education have a cooperative agreement whereby all JTG instructors meet the standards for teacher certification, and, in return, students completing the JTG course are awarded

one vocational credit toward high school graduation. JTG received $400,000 in state-appropriated vocational education funds to supplement its JTPA funding. The vocational funds allow JTG to enroll students who are not eligible for JTPA.

The eight SDAs that do not have JTG programs do have some other type of school-to-work transition program in their local schools. These other school-to-work transition programs also have an agreement with the Department of Labor that allows them to award vocational credit to students successfully completing the course.

VICTORY and JTPA Funds for Employment Training for AFDC Clients

VICTORY, support for Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) clients seeking employment or training, began as Tennessee's Work Incentive (WIN) program. At this time, VICTORY is the only employment training program for AFDC clients in the state. Funded through the WIN and Food Stamp Employment Training programs, VICTORY's resources have declined substantially over the years. Interestingly, JTPA funding has kept VICTORY alive during the last program year and will maintain job training opportunities for Human Services clients until Tennessee implements its version of the new federal Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program next year.

In 1987, job training for AFDC recipients was given a major boost through a cooperative agreement between the Tennessee Department of Human Services and the Department of Labor's JTPA program. That year, a $4.8 million allocation of JTPA Title II 78-percent funds was carried over from the previous program year. The Department of Labor earmarked these carry-over funds for services to AFDC clients to compensate for the cuts to VICTORY's WIN funding. The one-time allocation of JTPA funds provided training to AFDC clients during PY88-89 and will carry over into PY89-90 in some counties.

When the JTPA money was made available for Human Services clients, each PIC was charged with developing its own plan in cooperation with local Human Services offices. Under these contracts, the PIC was the designated recipient of grants to serve the AFDC recipients in its area. Each PIC and Human Services office plan is slightly different. Some PICs house JTPA staff in the local welfare office, while others serve AFDC referrals in their offices. A few PICs subcontracted with community organizations to provide all services under the JTPA carry-over contract. Most PICs include some opportunity for occupational training in their plans, although many concentrate on providing on-the-job training (OJT), employability skills development, and job placement.

This program has created local partnerships between welfare and JTPA that will undoubtedly facilitate cooperative agreements for the new JOBS program. JTPA may serve a major role in providing employment and training services under JOBS. At this time, the role of JTPA and of each education agency is not certain. The new JOBS program does not emphasize postsecondary education, so the Board of Regents' institutions may not play a major role. Both area vocational-technical schools and community colleges already serve some AFDC clients in remedial and GED programs and this will continue when these clients are supported by JOBS. The JOBS program emphasizes return to school for clients under eighteen, and the State Department of Education expects that local schools will work with local welfare offices to re-enroll this group in school.

Columbia State Community College

The SDA at Columbia State Community College serves eight rural counties. The JTPA office is located off campus in its own building. The SDA staff believe that the relationship between the SDA and the college has no effect on the number of JTPA clients referred to vocational education. Even so, this SDA has numerous cooperative agreements with the college, with two postsecondary area vocational-technical schools, and with local secondary institutions.

This SDA provides most of its own services directly from eight local Job Training Centers located in each of the SDA's counties. The Job Training Centers do intake and assessment and provide the following direct services: literacy, basic skills, job readiness training, GED preparation, consumer education, computer literacy and office automation skills, OJT, job search, and placement. Because it established these centers, the SDA does not refer clients to educational institutions for basic skills and remedial education. An Adult and Community Education 8-percent literacy program is located in this SDA; however, the only people the SDA refers to it are those who are not looking for employment.

Coordination with Postsecondary Area Vocational-Technical Schools

Columbia State Job Training refers clients to one of its two area vocational-technical schools to participate in the schools' regular occupational training. Clients enrolled under the regular Title II-A program can receive assistance with tuition, fees, and supplies for up to fifty-two weeks. Participants in the Board of Regents' 8-percent program (administered

through Columbia State Community College) can complete longer programs. Most vocational students are enrolled through the 8-percent program.

The Job Training Office also has special contracts with the area vocational-technical schools to provide JTPA clients with short-term training in high demand occupations. These special courses are only formed when no local program already exists. This year, the programs are certified nursing assistant (ten weeks), small engine repair (fourteen weeks), and entrepreneurial child care, which prepares participants to establish their own family day care homes. The child care program is funded with 6-percent performance incentive money and lasts six months.

Secondary Vocational Centers and Boards of Education

Columbia Job Training subcontracts youth programs and some additional occupational training through the secondary schools. Two boards of education have established Licensed Practical Nurse programs into which JTPA participants are referred. Youth services are subcontracted based on a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Virtually all the county school districts have contracts to provide vocational orientation. Aimed at in-school youth, the vocational orientation program is a two-semester course in pre-employment and work maturity competencies, as well as in basic education skills for the workplace. The boards of education also work with JTPA by providing special projects for summer youth work experience programs, which are operated by a PIC subcontractor. In this program, youth perform jobs such as building maintenance and bookbinding projects at the schools.

JTPA Cooperation with Columbia State Community College

Although cooperation between the college and the SDA may appear natural because they are part of the same institution, the Job Training program operates independently from the college. Therefore, the SDA has cooperative agreements with other college departments to provide services for JTPA clients.

The primary source of vocational education for JTPA clients at the Columbia SDA is through individual referrals to the college's one- and two-year occupational degree programs. Most individual referral clients are enrolled in the JTPA 8-percent program, which covers tuition and supplies, for one year. Clients interested in two-year degrees may enroll in the JTPA 78-percent program to receive support during the last year of their program. (PIC policy limits 78-percent funding to fifty-two weeks of training for

participants who intend to seek employment immediately thereafter.) The 8-percent program is widely advertised at the college as a source of financial aid to low-income students, so 8-percent clients are as likely to hear about the program from the college as from JTPA.

State Set-Aside (78-Percent Carry-Over Funds) for Human Services Clients

The Columbia SDA is one of the few SDAs in the state of Tennessee that has decided to subcontract for services to AFDC recipients with the special 78-percent carry-over funds designated for Human Services clients. When the money became available, the YWCA was already operating a program to reintroduce women into the labor market. Columbia worked with the YWCA to develop a program, similar to that already offered by the YWCA, but tailored to the needs of the AFDC clients. Columbia then used its carry-over funds to support its clients in the YWCA program. The YWCA provides two weeks of employability skills training followed by job placement assistance. Women who are not ready to enter the labor market following the three-week class are referred to the SDA for enrollment in other JTPA programs.

Motlow State Community College

Motlow State Community College is another college that is the SDA administration in its area. The Job Training Office serves six counties, including five rural counties. Assessment and referral services are subcontracted in the five rural counties, and the college office provides direct services in its own county. The vocational institutions in the SDA are three area vocational-technical schools and the community college, which offers classes off-campus in eleven counties.

Like Columbia, Motlow Job Training uses the college and vocational schools for occupational training, especially under the Board of Regents' 8-percent grant. The local Job Training Office at Motlow does less of its own remedial education, using more outside remedial education resources than Columbia does. The SDA estimates that approximately one-third of its clients attend the community college or area vocational-technical school for occupational and basic skills training.

Like Columbia, Motlow staff believe that they do not use the community college or vocational institutions more because they are a part of the college. They do use the college and vocational schools almost exclusively for their occupational skills training, but this is

because in the rural counties served by the SDA, the state schools are the only programs available.

Coordination with Local Schools

The public high schools in all of the SDA's counties have JTPA programs. Each year, the SDA issues one RFP for all youth services. School districts primarily respond to the RFPs. As a result, there is some kind of school-to-work transition or basic skills remediation program in each county. One county has a JTG program in three of its schools. Four counties operate dropout prevention and basic skills remediation programs. One county has established an alternative program for disabled students with JTPA funds. Another county has a dropout program for youth referred from the county juvenile services office. All of these programs are operated under performance-based contracts. The SDA reports that it has had no problem with performance contracts with the public schools.

Postsecondary Education

All postsecondary education for JTPA clients of the Motlow Job Training office is conducted on an individual referral basis. Motlow does not fund separate occupational skills classes for its participants. For clients referred to programs at either the community college or the area vocational-technical school, the SDA pays for tuition, books, child care, travel expenses, and some health needs related to training (e.g., required physical exams and glasses). Most JTPA clients also apply for Pell Grants and other financial aid.

Motlow State has generally been impressed by the long-term success (wages and job retention) of its clients who complete long-term vocational education programs. Therefore, this SDA makes many referrals to vocational programs and does not limit the length of vocational training it will allow. Many students complete two-year programs, and some clients are supported through a three-year nursing program. Vocational education is not only supported with 8-percent funds, but also with 78-percent funds, 6-percent Incentive grants, Perkins single parent/homemaker grants, and Human Services funds. Up until this year, the SDA found it could support any client interested in occupational training, so it has not limited the number of clients referred or the length of training. The SDA is not sure it will be able to continue this practice, however, primarily because of the sharp decline in 8-percent funds available from the Board of Regents.

The SDA has one JTPA counselor at the community college and one at each of the area vocational-technical schools who meet with JTPA students on a regular basis to provide guidance, counseling, referrals, and to track the students' progress.

Generally, JTPA clients in occupational skills training are co-enrolled in 78-percent programs and the Board of Regents' 8-percent program. Motlow is one of three SDAs in the state that uses its 8-percent money almost exclusively to cover the cost of supportive services for those enrolled in educational programs. These clients receive help with tuition, books, and fees through the 78-percent program.

State Set-Aside (78-Percent Carry-Over Funds) for Human Services Clients

This SDA supports two JTPA staff people assigned as case managers for Human Services clients enrolled in JTPA through the state AFDC set-aside. These staff people travel to local Human Services offices to recruit clients that are interested in job training and placement. Interested AFDC recipients are referred to the JTPA office for intake and services. The AFDC recipients enrolled in the AFDC set-aside program are eligible for any JTPA service, including tuition support for occupational training at the community college or vocational-technical school. The JTPA case managers provide supplemental counseling and assistance with parenting skills, financial planning, and life skills for AFDC clients. Clients who do not enter occupational programs may enroll in basic skills courses, begin OJT, or accept a work experience placement.

COORDINATION IN WASHINGTON STATE

The State Board of Vocational Education (SBVE), which is independent from the state's educational systems, is the sole state agency for the administration of vocational education in Washington State. The SBVE distributes Perkins Vocational Education funds to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Board for Community College Education (SBCCE). SBVE is the administrative entity in Washington for the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) 8-Percent Education Coordination and Grants through a grant from the Employment Security Department (ESD).

Vocational education in Washington is delivered by the public secondary schools, five public postsecondary vocational-technical institutes that are operated by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), and twenty-seven community colleges. The public school system also includes eight area secondary skills centers that offer comprehensive vocational training for eleventh and twelfth grade students. Of these school systems, the technical institutes are the most active in providing skills training to JTPA participants. Those community colleges with relatively strong vocational education programs (in contrast to strong programs to transfer students to four-year institutions) are also likely to serve JTPA clients. High schools and area skills centers are most likely to work with JTPA to offer summer youth programs.

The ESD is the administrative agency for JTPA. Employment Security programs (Job Service) are administered by a separate division of the ESD. JTPA in Washington is delivered by twelve local service delivery areas (SDAs). This case study reviews the coordination between JTPA and vocational education in three of these SDAs.

State-Level Coordination

Although Washington's state-level employment and education agencies are not among the most active nationally in promoting joint JTPA, vocational education projects in local SDAs or schools and communication among agencies at the state level appears to be good. There is substantial cross membership, joint meetings, and mixed representation on special planning committees among the SBVE, the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC), the Washington State Council on Vocational Education (WSCOVE), and the Department of Social and Health Services (responsible for Aid for Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] and welfare-to-work programs in the state). State representatives have

worked well together on special planning projects such as the committees that planned the state's welfare-to-work demonstration project. Another example of such cooperation is that the State Board for Community Colleges, OSPI, and JTPA organized to obtain joint membership in the V-TECS curriculum consortium, allowing all three systems access to the resources of this national curricular materials center.

While all relevant state agencies work together to facilitate the planning of special state projects, these agencies have not created jointly funded programs or actively encouraged local JTPA or vocational educational programs to combine resources for local joint projects. Even the JTPA 8-Percent Education Coordination funds, usually used by states as a mechanism to develop joint education/JTPA programs, are not targeted for this in Washington. The state policy on the use of the JTPA 8-percent set-aside does not require 8-percent grant recipients to form education and job training partnerships.

In its biennial reports on vocational education coordination, WSCOVE provides recommendations to SBVE, vocational education, and SJTCC on ways to improve coordination. The WSCOVE Biennial Report is an excellent analysis of the effectiveness of JTPA, vocational education, and coordinated activities in Washington. Both the 1987 and 1989 Biennial Reports were widely circulated among state agencies and drew thoughtful responses to WSCOVE's recommendations. The 1989 Biennial Report makes the following recommendations about federal policy that the Council believes adversely affects state coordination:

- The U.S. Department of Education should press for legislation that provides financial incentives to local vocational education institutions that combine and share resources with JTPA. (WSCOVE concluded from its study that coordinated activities appear to be more related to information sharing than coordination of planning and job training activities.)

- The U.S. Department of Education in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor should recommend to Congress that the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act and the JTPA include complementary purposes, terminology, goals, and evaluation criteria.

These recommendations stem from ongoing problems identified by Washington State administrators and by administrators in other states. First, the small proportion of vocational education funded by the Perkins Act (five percent of vocational education

funding in Washington is federal funds) is considered a barrier to JTPA and vocational education coordination. Federal policy goals can have only a limited impact on vocational programs because the funding is so limited. Of course, the 8-Percent Education Coordination set-aside could be viewed as a federal incentive for coordination. However, the effectiveness of this incentive depends on how the state configures the 8-percent program. In Washington, state policy has not limited the use of the 8-Percent Education Coordination funding strictly to education/SDA partnerships.

The second ongoing issue relates to the fact that the purposes and goals of the JTPA and the Perkins Act are somewhat ambiguous and have complicated regulations, with neither being well-understood by local service providers. WSCOVE's research showed that most directors of vocational education and JTPA programs do not understand the differences between the two acts nor their purposes. WSCOVE's recommended solution to this problem is to make the acts more similar. Another solution to the problem that was offered by staff at the ESD is to waive client eligibility requirements for jointly funded programs. Although these suggestions might increase the joint use of JTPA and Perkins funds, they do not coincide with the different policy goals of the different federal acts.

The OSPI and the SBCCE are the other state agencies that provide vocational education and that could act to coordinate JTPA and vocational education. OSPI has a limited role in JTPA policy. An OSPI representative attends the SJTCC meetings, but only in an advisory capacity. The SBCCE, in contrast, is a full member of the SJTCC.

One OSPI representative argues that education had more representation in the administration of the CETA program than JTPA. Under CETA, there were more public representatives on the governing boards and, because of this, many different educational delivery systems were represented. Under JTPA, private industry councils (PICs) are only required to have one representative from education. This person usually represents one of the many different educational sectors in an SDA, and very often has no connection with vocational education.

Believing that lack of knowledge about the services offered by other agencies is one of the greatest barriers to coordination, OSPI is trying to encourage cooperation with JTPA by spreading information about JTPA programs and services. OSPI is planning to do more to encourage coordinated programs in the future by offering inservice training to bring secondary schools and JTPA staff together. However, performance contracts and the reporting burden of JTPA contracts also prevent some schools from entering into contracts

with PICs. In general, OSPI finds it difficult to encourage schools to work with JTPA because public education is very decentralized. Because each school district has an independent governing board, OSPI has had limited success in encouraging contracting with JTPA. Even now, school district vocational education plans should be reviewed by PICs; however, most PICs do not receive these plans on a regular basis. (This is common in many states.)

The 8-Percent Education Coordination Set-Aside

Washington had approximately $3.1 million available for 8-Percent Education Coordination activities and grants this year. SBVE administers the 8-Percent Education Coordination funds in Washington through a grant from the ESD. Twenty percent of the money is retained by the SBVE for administration, technical assistance, research, pilot projects, and program evaluation and eighty percent is distributed as direct grants. A proportion of the direct grant money is distributed to the SDAs by formula each year. Local PICs approve the plans for the 8-percent SDA set-asides. Other 8-percent funding is allocated to Governor's Statewide Projects, which are special projects targeted to employment generating activities and dropout prevention statewide. The remaining 8-percent project money is distributed through competitive statewide proposals.

Like many states, Washington is increasing its attention to improving the basic skills of its workforce. The Washington SJTCC has recommend that the JTPA 8-Percent Education Coordination money target services for individuals in need of basic educational skills development and/or improved workplace literacy. SJTCC first recommended that SDAs use 8-percent funds for basic skills and remediation in 1988. In previous years, the 8-percent funds were targeted to employment generating activities and special populations such as criminal offenders and limited-English proficient (LEP) clients. At this time, a few SDAs continue to use their formula allocations for employment generating activities, but the majority of 8-percent funds are used for some type of remediation or basic skills training.

Among the states visited for our study, Washington's policy for the use of 8-percent funds is one of the least restrictive, and it does little to encourage partnerships between SDAs and educational institutions. In order to make the program flexible, the state has not imposed the requirements that exist in other states that 8-percent grants go to educational institutions or partnerships between SDAs and education. SDAs can use the 8-percent SDA set-aside funds in any way they wish: the SDAs are encouraged to use the

money for basic skills or remedial education, but the money can be spent on programs operated by the SDA or by any type of contractor. The primary difference between the use of 8-percent funds and Title II funds is that 8-percent programs may claim a wider variety of outcomes as positive terminations such as enrollment in Title II-A or completion of educational objectives. Because Title II-A funds are subject to more rigorous performance standards—primarily employment standards—8-percent projects are more likely to enroll youth and hard-to-serve individuals.

The other 8-percent funds, the competitive grants, increase the number and the type of agencies that get involved in JTPA training. In awarding these grants, the SBVE works with a review team (representing OSPI, SBCCE, SJTCC, WSCOVE, and community-based organizations [CBOs]), which reviews the proposals and recommends projects to be funded. The SBVE distributes forty percent of the 8-percent project money (approximately $1.2 million this year) to agencies across the state for special projects. The less restrictive performance standards for 8-percent programs encourage providers to apply for the grants. Educational institutions that do not consider immediate employment their mission are more likely to apply for the 8-percent grants than other JTPA contracts because the 8-percent grants accept educational outcomes as positive terminations. Other agencies that do not contract with PICs may also apply to SBVE for 8-percent grants.

Although state policy does not require a local education agency (LEA) to participate in each 8-percent project, public educational institutions are well represented on the list of competitive grant recipients. The 8-percent competitive grants are awarded to a wide variety of recipients: CBOs and community colleges are the most common recipients; and school districts, vocational-technical institutes, SDAs, and one Job Service office also received grants this year.

Governor's Coordination Criteria

Perhaps the one clear state policy statement on coordination that is available to SDAs in Washington is the Governor's Coordination Criteria, which appear in the Governor's Special Services Plan (in compliance with federal requirements). Although this is not a policy that will create jointly funded programs, it provides state-level guidelines for SDAs on coordination activities. The coordination criteria specify the agencies with which SDAs are expected to communicate. All the required coordination is in the form of communication such as the sharing of plans and client referral, rather than jointly operated

programs or a division of services. The coordination criteria specify the following three levels of coordination:

- *Level 1: Critical Coordination—Signed Agreements Required*
  At this level, each SDA is responsible for developing written agreements with representatives from the Department of Social and Health Services (public assistance), Employment Security, other SDAs in geographic proximity, aging programs, and the SBVE regarding the 8-percent program, the state-funded Job Skills program, and vocational education (Perkins). The written agreements are incorporated into the SDAs' Job Training Plans. The agreements must specify means and methods of meeting mutual goals, but SDAs are not encouraged to develop joint programs even at this highest level of coordination.

- *Level 2: Documented Consultation and Information Sharing with Other Agencies and Organizations*
  At this level, the SDA is responsible for describing methods to ensure ongoing consultation and information sharing with business and labor, economic development agencies, education and training programs (to avoid unnecessary duplication), rehabilitation services, Native American grantees, and migrant and seasonal farm workers programs.

- *Level 3: Information Sharing*
  Finally, SDAs are required to share information about programs and services with CBOs, community action agencies, tribal and Indian services providers, and the United Way, as well as related federal, state, and local programs.

The Family Independence Program

The Washington State employment and training program for public assistance recipients is called the Family Independence Program or FIP. FIP is a pilot program that began in July of 1988 and is now available to public assistance recipients at fifteen sites. It will be implemented statewide when resources are available. FIP is a joint project of the ESD (the Job Service division, not JTPA) and the Department of Social and Health Services. These two state agencies have equal representation on the FIP executive committee responsible for all policy and administration. Planning for regions is conducted by regional boards that include the ESD and the Department of Social and Health Services regional administrators, and representatives of children and family services (child care),

family support enforcement, and JTPA programs. At the local level, Employment Security job counselors are co-located with FIP caseworkers at the local welfare offices. Each local office refers clients to JTPA and vocational education programs as appropriate.

The initial planning process for FIP brought together representatives from JTPA, education, Employment Security, Social and Health Services, and CBOs. In order to develop the program and design the legislation, fourteen different work groups were assembled to address individual design issues, including child care, family support enforcement, education, and case management. These groups included representatives from JTPA, public and private education, SBCCE, SJTCC, SBVE, OSPI, and CBOs. The FIP work group that addressed employment and training issues included PIC chairs and SDA directors. Employment Security and Social and Health Services reviewed the recommendations from each of these fourteen committees and developed the plan and legislation. The FIP plan was approved by the state legislature in 1987. Last year, of approximately twenty thousand clients in FIP offices, eight thousand volunteered for FIP and completed Employability Development Plans (EDPs) and thirty-five hundred FIP enrollees received basic, remedial, or occupational education.

Every client that enters a FIP office for income support is given information about FIP's employment and training services. Interested clients attend a program orientation and decide if they want to enroll. Once enrolled, a FIP caseworker completes the first part of a Self-Sufficiency Plan that analyzes whether a client will be able to go to school or work. Some clients are referred to social workers or community support services for help with family, health, or other problems that will interfere with training or employment. If the case worker determines that the applicant does not face substantial barriers, the client is offered the opportunity to meet with a Job Service Specialist to complete the second part of the Self-Sufficiency Plan. The Job Service Specialist assesses the wage that the client must earn to remain self-sufficient—a wage that will cover living expenses plus the extra costs of self-sufficiency such as child care and medical expenses. A traditional employability plan, assessing the client's interests, aptitudes, and skills, is also completed, and the Job Service Specialist and client identify an occupation in which the client will earn enough to support the family within a few years of entering the labor market.

The FIP offices can use JTPA and vocational education resources to fulfill any part of the employment and training plan. FIP actually relies quite heavily on public education and JTPA for the education and training of FIP participants. Many FIP participants in

college programs receive Pell grants and scholarships. In these cases, FIP pays for counseling, case management, and support services, including vouchers for child care.

The state does not track the number of FIP clients enrolled in each of the different educational systems. In one FIP office, approximately one-half of clients in training were enrolled in one of two vocational-technical institutes; approximately one-third were enrolled in a community college; and the remainder attended proprietary programs. Although these proportions are unknown for the other FIP offices, FIP counselors generally make extensive referrals to community colleges and vocational institutes.

Recent changes in JTPA have made it easier for FIP to use that system. Most FIP clients need fairly extensive training in order to compete for wages that will support their families. When JTPA began, its emphasis on short-term training would have made its training programs incompatible with the needs of the FIP program. The shift in recent years toward longer-term JTPA training has made it possible for FIP to use JTPA.

Local Coordination

Because of the relatively neutral stance taken by Washington State agencies regarding the kinds of local JTPA-vocational education program coordination that should occur (beyond joint planning and client referral), the amount of local coordination varies substantially from SDA to SDA. The state's approach to coordination may also be partially responsible for the absence of coordination in some areas. A WSCOVE biennial report, based on a survey of all LEAs, addressed the topic of local coordination between JTPA and vocational education programs. Some of the more interesting findings about coordination from the WSCOVE report include the following:

- The potential exists for greater coordination at the local level, especially with secondary schools. Postsecondary institutions are far more likely than secondary institutions to respond to JTPA requests for proposals (e.g., in 1987, ninety-six percent of postsecondary institutions responded to JTPA Request for Proposals [RFPs], compared to forty-five percent of secondary schools). Only nineteen percent of secondary schools received JTPA Title II-A funding in FY87.

- Less than twelve percent of secondary schools offering vocational programs regularly conduct joint planning with their local PICs, compared to forty-eight percent of postsecondary institutions.

- From the WSCOVE survey of vocational educators, comments responding to the question of why JTPA services were not used included lack of need, lack of time, excess paperwork, timeframe too short, too many restrictions, and concerns about performance-based contracts.

- Approximately fourteen percent of Title II-A 78-percent money is spent on classroom training. In the secondary system, one-third of JTPA funds were used for occupational skills training. In the postsecondary system, more than two-thirds of JTPA funds were used for occupational skills training. The balance was used for remedial instruction and job retention services.

In the SDAs visited for this case study, the primary relationship between SDAs and local vocational education entities is through individual referral of JTPA clients to vocational or basic skills programs. These referrals do not involve any formal agreement between the SDA and the educational institution. The case managers at local SDAs identify individual JTPA clients that need basic, remedial, or occupational skills training and then identify the best source of that training. This might be an SDA-run program, a CBO, a private school, or a public school or college program. Many clients are referred to Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Education Development (GED) programs in public schools. SDAs also take advantage of occupational skills classes at vocational-technical institutes and community colleges. The state does not collect any information about the numbers of JTPA participants receiving classroom versus on-the-job training (OJT) or job search assistance, nor does it track the numbers served in public educational institutions versus CBOs and other types of agencies.

At the state level, administrators believe that the involvement of public education in JTPA training is limited in part by the length of the programs offered in the public schools. Many SDAs and JTPA subcontractors in Washington—most of which operate on strict performance standards and contracts—rely on very short classroom skills training or use OJT almost exclusively to give clients occupational skills training. The statewide focus on basic skills training has been accompanied by an increase in training for some clients, but almost exclusively it has been in basic skills training, not occupational skills training. It is possible that the trend in U.S. Department of Labor performance standards toward emphasis on long-term retention in employment may encourage more classroom occupational skills training in the future.

Bellingham VTI and the Northwest Washington PIC

The Northwest Washington PIC is a non-profit corporation that serves a four-county area. Northwest Washington PIC's service area encompasses one vocational-technical institute, two community colleges, Northwest Indian College, and branch college campuses in other counties. The PIC operates almost all of its own programs, and contracts out only its 8-percent programs. However, the PIC uses local education resources by referring some of its participants to public institutions on an individual basis.

Comprehensive Competency Program Centers for Basic and Remedial Education

The establishment of Comprehensive Competency Program (CCP) learning centers has been this PIC's primary effort to develop cooperative programs with local schools. The development and operation of these basic skills centers has been supported primarily through 8-percent statewide competitive and SDA set-aside funds.

Although this SDA does most if its own training, the PIC was motivated to find a contractor for its 8-percent project in order to meet the required financial match. Because the PIC is solely a JTPA organization, it does not have outside funds available to claim as a match. Yet, when the PIC looked to the public schools, it found that existing programs did not meet its needs: existing basic skills programs, primarily in ABE, were already filled to capacity and did not offer the intensive, self-paced training the PIC wanted for its clients. Therefore, the PIC used its 8-percent grants to build capacity within the public school system to provide remedial and basic skills education tailored to the needs of out-of-school and at-risk youth and adults seeking employment.

The first center was established as a joint venture of a community college, a school district, and the PIC. The PIC purchased curriculum, instructional materials, and computers for the computer-aided instruction portions of the special competency-based curriculum used by the centers. JTPA continues to own the equipment purchased for the centers, even though it is located at the schools. The PIC needed to get special permission from SBVE to purchase equipment with 8-percent funds because such purchases with JTPA funds are usually prohibited. However, the PIC believed it was important to have a lasti g, tangible relationship with the CCP learning centers in order to guarantee that the centers would be available to serve JTPA clients in the future.

Eight CCP centers have now been established in the SDA, and there are twenty-four such centers in the state as a result of other SDAs and schools adopting the model. The Northwest Washington PIC has provided different types of support to the different centers. In some cases, the PIC purchased the equipment, curriculum, or software with either SDA set-aside or statewide competitive 8-percent funds. In other cases, enrollment in the centers is open to all students and adults, and the school receives ABE funds to serve JTPA clients. Additionally, the PIC pays tuition for its clients or pays all the costs of an entire session, which would be open only to JTPA clients, because ABE funds are already committed to other programs at the school. In most cases, the centers offer high school credits to youth who enroll in the program. This allows in-school youth who are behind in their credits and, therefore, at risk of dropping out, to make up credits and graduate with their class.

The Bellingham Vocational-Technical Institute (VTI) is the site of one CCP center. This year, Bellingham VTI received an 8-percent statewide competitive grant to fund its Center for Educational Success, a skills center first established with the help of JTPA funding. The Center for Educational Success, located on the VTI campus, offers basic skills, remedial education, and English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) training in a self-paced program.

The project serves both youth and adults whose lack of skills in reading, writing, speaking English, and computation presents a barrier to job training, employment, and job retention. The participants represent four low-income groups that often reject traditional schooling: adult job seekers, high school dropouts or at-risk students (those who are behind in credits), single parents, and those with limited-English proficiency. The Bellingham CCP center allows these students to receive high school credits for their attendance. The VTI serves LEP adults through a Bureau of Refugee Assistance contract with the state Department of Social and Health Services, but this service is limited to refugees. This year's 8-percent competitive grant allows the center to also serve JTPA-eligible ESL clients who are not refugees.

Although the center is located on the VTI campus, it is housed in its own building and is not structured like a regular classroom. The self-paced curriculum, individual attention, and computer-aided instruction all lend themselves to an atmosphere of a CBO or an adult learning environment.

The Center for Educational Success provides self-paced competency-based instruction for approximately sixty students according to individualized learning plans. The program operates three sessions per day. Each session meets for three hours, five days a week, to provide intensive remedial education. The skills center is supervised by a certificated teacher, instructional aides, and volunteers from the local Literacy Council. Students are pre- and post-tested using the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) to ascertain their levels of basic skills and to determine realistic student goals. LEP students are tested with a Basic English Skills Test (BEST) to determine the appropriate instructional level. After completing their education at the skills center, some students re-enter school or begin job training, while others find jobs. Those without a high school degree or GED are encouraged to complete one.

The CCP system is a good example of a cooperative venture between JTPA and educational institutions. Placing the centers in public schools has some complications due to differences in the philosophy of the PIC and traditional education. Schools offer courses and credits based on the amount of time students spend in the classroom, while the CCP system is based on improvement of skills measured by competency tests. The institutions and instructors have had to adjust to a different instructional method to operate the CCP centers, and a special system of credits based on competency tests had to be negotiated in order for the CCP centers to offer high school credits. On the other hand, the location of CCP centers in public schools allows the classes to be taught by certified teachers, which allows the centers to offer high school credit for its courses.

In some areas in the state, SDAs have established CCP centers outside of public schools. These programs are operated by non-certified staff, and, therefore, the students cannot get high school credit. As a result, at least for in-school youth, the CCP model is more effective as a partnership between JTPA and a public school.

Individual Referrals to Vocational Education

The Northwest Washington PIC's collaboration with vocational education in providing occupational skills training occurs through individual referral of JTPA clients to existing training programs. These referrals do not involve contractual agreements between the PIC and the educational institutions. Rather, the SDA identifies some clients who can benefit from occupational skills training and then refers them to an appropriate course. The SDA refers clients to the community colleges, the vocational-technical institute, and to

private proprietary schools. Approximately thirty percent of the SDA's clients receive some kind of vocational skills training.

When clients are referred for vocational training, the SDA staff provides all the intake, case management, counseling, testing, and job placement services. The students attend the vocational training courses like regular students. JTPA covers the cost of tuition and other expenses for its clients in vocational training. JTPA clients may be enrolled in training for up to two years.

Bingen Job Service Center

The Bingen Job Service Center (JSC) is the local branch Employment Security office, which has developed over time into a one-stop employment training and job placement center. The design of the Bingen JSC is unique in the state. The wide variety of public grants and services managed by the center can probably be attributed to the efforts of the center's director (a Job Service employee) and to the fact that it is located in a rural community where few other service providers are available to offer employment services. The center has contracts with two PICs and provides all JTPA services to the residents of the two counties in its service area. It also administers FIP, dislocated worker programs, a state older workers program, and the immigration funds for ESL training.

The JSC has an advisory committee to help secure contracts that can expand services and to make sure services are responsive to the needs of the community. The advisory group consists of all the PIC members from the two counties, a state senator, two school superintendents, two bank managers, the administrator for Department of Health and Social Services, two county commissioners, the manager of one county's port authority, and the director of the local Community Action Agency.

Bingen's Learning Centers

The Bingen JSC operates three community Job Service offices—the main office in Bingen and two satellite offices. Each office operates a learning center that offers computer-aided remedial education, ESL, and job search assistance. They also offer skills training on general office equipment, high school and college correspondence classes, ABE co-sponsored by two community colleges, alternative courses for high school students, and GED preparation through Community Education. The learning center is available to JSC clients through FIP, JTPA programs, immigration resident applicants, and dislocated

worker programs. Those not eligible for these programs, including high school students who need to make up credits to graduate but who are not JTPA-eligible, can attend classes at the center for a fee.

Clients generally attend these learning center classes for three hours per day for between two and three months. Many of the courses are open-entry/open-exit and self-paced so that clients can choose to attend them during times that are convenient to their work schedules or family obligations. Many clients have jobs (especially the ESL students) and others are in OJT or work experience placements through JTPA.

The learning centers are funded by a JTPA 8-percent grant, two community colleges, the public schools, and Job Service. The 8-percent grant pays for the basic instructional costs and provides some support services (primarily stipends). Learning centers offer ABE programs through an agreement with the community colleges in which the colleges pay for the teachers at each site. JSC enrolls the welfare-to-work clients of the FIP program in a learning center class by co-enrolling FIP clients in JTPA. (Bingen JSC has no training money in the FIP program—all training for FIP clients is paid for by JTPA.) Most 8-percent clients are co-enrolled in another JTPA program for OJT, work experience, or job placement.

The JSC training provides basic skills remediation that was generally unavailable through existing educational resources. There are no alternative high school programs in any of the school districts in the two counties. According to the JSC, there were no day-time adult education programs available before the centers were established. Because child care centers are virtually non-existent in this rural area, FIP and JTPA participants without family or friends to care for children in the evenings were excluded from ABE or ESL. The community colleges that provide funds for the JSC learning center instructors are not physically located in the counties served by JSC and could not generate sufficient enrollment to begin extension classes in the area. The JSC offices can offer ABE because they are accessible to the population of the two counties, and JTPA referrals provide sufficient enrollment to guarantee enough clients to make the project worthwhile.

Occupational Skills Training

The Bingen JSC offers very little classroom occupational skills training to its JTPA clients. At any one time, the JSC will only have about ten clients in vocational education. The Bingen JSC relies on OJT to assist JTPA clients in learning occupational skills because in the rural counties there are limited job openings in any one occupation, making it difficult

to place clients training in school. Clients placed in OJT are more likely to use skills learned because they often stay with the employer who trained them.

The Bingen JSC will pay tuition for some clients to receive classroom occupational skills training; however, clients may attend classroom training for a maximum of six months in order to keep costs down. Because there is no postsecondary vocational education or any public vocational education in Bingen JSC's two counties, clients typically do not have access to longer-term training anyway. Occasionally clients will commute to one of the community colleges to take vocational courses.

King County and the Seattle/King County PIC

The Seattle/King County PIC is responsible for JTPA in Washington's large urban SDA. The PIC is a consortium of the City of Seattle and the balance of the county. Virtually all of the SDA's services are delivered by contractors who secure contracts through the RFP process. The King County Work Training program (a unit of the county government) has a contract to deliver most JTPA services outside of the City of Seattle. King County receives 8-percent SDA set-aside and 6-percent funds from the PIC to support some special demonstration programs. There is no vocational-technical institute in the City of Seattle, and the SDA does relatively little vocational skills training. The Seattle Public Schools have a contract to offer summer youth programs.

There are two vocational-technical institutes and two community colleges in the SDA. Although many JTPA clients attend these schools (primarily for remedial education or ESL) or programs at the secondary schools, there is little joint effort between the SDA and the public schools. The SDA attributes this to such problems as different planning systems, different timeframes, and too little money available to make joint projects worthwhile. Even so, the PIC has a representative from one of the vocational-technical institutes and one from secondary education.

The King County Work Training program, which is within the county's Department of Human Resources, is the employment and training center for the entire SDA except for the City of Seattle. King County provides the full range of JTPA services, including client intake, assessment, case management, job search, and job placement. The county subcontracts for some additional services; for example, Youth Service Bureaus

(community organizations) have conducted job search training on subcontract to the county for many years.

King County refers JTPA clients to community colleges, especially for GED preparation and testing, ABE, and ESL. Referrals are also made to vocational-technical institutes, particularly for vocational skills training. Although the agency does not track the number of clients receiving each kind of training, it estimates that approximately one-half of the clients are referred to some kind of education program and that fifty to sixty percent of those referrals are for occupational skills training, reflecting an agency emphasis on good basic skills and occupational training.

King County 8-Percent (SDA Set-Aside) for Basic Skills

King County receives a special grant of PIC 8-percent SDA set-aside and 6-percent performance incentive funds to operate special basic skills pilots. King County uses 8-percent funds to offer basic skills and pre-employment skills to prison inmates and young AFDC recipients.

The basic skills for inmates project is a small pilot. One county staff member is responsible for the entire project. He recruits inmates at the county prison who are interested in remedial education during incarceration. He provides self-paced curriculum materials and individual tutoring for inmates to improve their basic skills. Some participants will complete high school credits or prepare for the GED while in jail. Upon their release, the King County staff encourage the participants to continue with JTPA for counseling, job search assistance, or further training.

The second King County program supported by the 8-percent SDA set-aside funds is called the Young Family Independence Project (YFIP). This 8-percent project is an example of a successful demonstration: although it started with 8-percent funding, the project received local and state recognition and substantial additional funding to expand operations. YFIP began as a small pilot project in 1987 with 8-percent funds from the Seattle/King County PIC. Because of the success of the pilot project, King County appropriated local tax dollars to expand the YFIP, now serving a total of one hundred and forty teenage parents annually. This year the program received additional funding from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to expand into other communities.

YFIP is a partnership of public and community services. Education services are provided by the school districts, vocational-technical institutes, and community colleges.

Each participant receives at least two home visits by Public Health nurses to assist the young mothers and their children with basic health education and preventative health care.. Parenting education is offered in formal classes; food and nutrition education is provided through King County Cooperative Extension programs. Youth Service Bureaus at each site provide individual, family, and relationship counseling as well as teen parenting support groups. Finally, each participant has a case manager who identifies his or her employment and training needs, arranges for subsidized employment and support services such as clothing and transportation, and ensures that the participant has access to all needed social and educational services.

By any measure, this project has been successful. This year, sixty percent of YFIP clients found employment in unsubsidized jobs at a wage high enough to support themselves without public assistance. More than ninety percent made substantial progress toward self-sufficiency. YFIP was chosen as the National Alliance of Business's Distinguished Performance Youth Program of the Year for 1988.

Eight-Percent Statewide Competitive Grants

Unlike Bingen, where the JSC is both the local 8-percent competitive grant recipient and the agency that operates all of the other JTPA programs in its area, or even in Bellingham, where the Vocational-Technical Institute's learning center, an 8-percent statewide competitive grant recipient, was created in close cooperation with the SDA, the Seattle/King County PIC is not an active participant in the 8-percent programs in its area. Despite this, there are four 8-percent competitive programs in the Seattle area—more funding than in any other part of the state.

The Employment Security office and TARGET, a consortium of vocational-technical schools and community colleges, are the recipients of one 8-percent competitive grant in the Seattle area. Their Workforce Readiness Project is a cooperative venture with the Washington Institute of Applied Technology and the Virginia Mason Hospital/Clinics. It provides work-centered basic skills, job readiness training, and OJT in entry-level health care occupations. The objective of the program is to develop individual career goals while increasing reading, writing, computation, communication, problem solving, and interpersonal skills.

Seattle Central Community College is the recipient of a grant to support Seaward Bound Marine High School. Seaward Bound Marine High School is a cooperative venture of the Seattle Central Community College, the Seattle School District, and representatives

of the maritime industry. JTPA-eligible students (ages sixteen and older) are offered a two-year course of study, combining remedial academic, vocational, and self-development training at a waterfront facility on the Lake Washington Ship Canal.

South Seattle Community College has a ten-week feeder session for ABE and ESL female students who demonstrate an interest in entering one of two of the college's specially designed short-term skills training programs. The feeder program prepares disadvantaged women to enter classes in Computer Literacy and Auto Parts Merchandising and offers assistance with job search and placement.

Finally, the Employment Opportunities Center (a community organization in Seattle), provides basic education skills development and workplace literacy to individuals who are unlikely to be accepted to employment programs because they lack literacy skills in either English or their native language. The program provides classroom instruction in basic educational skills (including literacy), workplace literacy, and OJT.

Conclusion

Washington's SBVE, the agency responsible for coordination with JTPA, is in an unusual position because it is independent from the state's educational systems. This position allows it to allocate the resources in its control without bias toward either secondary or postsecondary education; on the other hand, it may prevent it from exerting any authority over these agencies to enhance coordination. Generally, the Washington state agencies are not among the most active in promoting coordinated programs and services; however, state administrators do work together on planning and implementation issues when the need arises.

WSCOVE has found that secondary institutions are less involved with JTPA than are postsecondary institutions. We suspect this may be true in many states. Still, examples of coordination between secondary education and JTPA can be found in Washington. The programs for teenage parents in King County are an example.

The 8-percent grants in Washington fund most of the innovative projects we saw. An especially interesting model is the provision of basic skills and remedial education by postsecondary vocational institutes. The use of JTPA funds to establish learning centers on technical institute campuses is an excellent example of how these organizations can build their capacity to work together over the long run.

COORDINATION IN SELECTED CALIFORNIA SDAS

Mother Lode Job Training Agency

Mother Lode Job Training Agency is a service delivery area (SDA) in Northern California serving four rural counties. The SDA is a special district with its administrative offices in Sonora. Each county has a field office that provides Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) services to the clients in its area.

There is one community college in the SDA area (Columbia College near Sonora) as well as high school adult education and regional occupational programs (ROP) with which JTPA can coordinate. This case study includes information about the coordination between JTPA and education throughout the SDA, with an emphasis on the services in Tuolumne County, where the community college and the one ROP are located.

Communication between Mother Lode Job Training Agency (MLJTA) and the local education agencies (LEAs) appears good; however, the coordination of services is limited. MLJTA has a part-time education coordinator who keeps educational agencies informed of JTPA services and encourages referrals to the Job Training Agency. MLJTA makes very limited individual referrals to regular programs at the community college and the ROP. The educational agencies have no contracts for special services or classes for JTPA. MLJTA uses its 8-percent formula funds for welfare-to-work program participants as required by state law. Mother Lode is also the recipient of an 8-percent special project grant, which the SDA uses to support clients in classroom training.

Referrals to Vocational and Adult Education

MLJTA makes few referrals to either Columbia College or the ROPs in its counties. The SDA places some clients in private vocational programs, but does very little classroom training in conjunction with vocational or adult education. The primary services offered by the SDA are a five-day job-seeking skills and vocational assessment workshop and job placement activities. Some clients also receive assistance through on-the-job training (OJT), support services, and counseling.

The limited job market in this rural area is the primary reason why MLJTA does not use classroom training. The local job market generates little demand for employees in any one occupation. The SDA's training strategy is to use OJT so that clients can learn skills to use with a specific local employer. OJT contracts ensure that job placement will occur

upon successful completion of training. In contrast, the SDA has found that classroom-trained clients cannot always find jobs.

Another reason the SDA sponsors so little education is that it believes its clients generally do not want, or need, occupational or basic skills training. MLJTA staff said that people come to them to find jobs; they cannot afford to be without work long enough to complete the one- or two-year training programs offered by the college and ROP.

Columbia College and Sonora High School ROP

Columbia College will accept referrals of JTPA clients to any of its occupational programs. Recently, the SDA has not referred its general (Title II-A) clients to the college for vocational training. The college serves JTPA clients with an 8-percent grant, which is described later.

The ROP at Sonora High School accepts adults into virtually all of its occupational programs, and it accepts JTPA referrals into all of its adult classes. The ROP and MLJTA make referrals back and forth: if the ROP counselors identify a student who needs assistance with fees, child care, or transportation, they refer the student to the job training office, and MLJTA refers some clients to the ROP for vocational training. The ROP estimates its programs serve approximately fifteen JTPA clients a year.

The ROP receives no funds from JTPA for serving students referred by MLJTA. Until now, the ROP's enrollment has been less than the enrollment cap established by the state on the amount of state ADA (funding calculated based on average daily attendance) that it can receive. As long as its enrollment remains below its state cap, the ROP can continue to collect ADA for each student that it enrolls, including a JTPA client. However, if the ROP exceeds its enrollment cap it has no source of funding to support increased enrollment. This year, the ROP exceeded its cap by twelve students. The ROP has not charged JTPA for training JTPA clients; however, if enrollments continue to exceed the ROP's cap, it might consider charging JTPA for its referrals.

JTPA clients and other students enrolled in one of the ROP courses usually attend classes two to three hours per day for the first semester. Most programs are structured in an open-entry format so that students can begin at any time. Students usually are placed in ROP work experience jobs to get hands-on training in conjunction with their classwork during the second semester.

Eight-Percent Formula Allocation Funds—Extra Support for GAIN

In California, the 8-percent funds allocated to SDAs by formula (which make up fifty percent of all state 8-percent funds) must be used for clients of the state's welfare-to-work program, GAIN (Greater Avenues for Independence). The state has established that the first 8-percent fund service priority for GAIN is tutoring and remediation, and the second priority is other services, including assessment. The 8-percent funds are used only for priority services that are not already available from some other training program. When a service is already available, GAIN clients are referred to the existing training source.

In the Mother Lode SDA, 8-percent money is used for tutoring and remediation services for GAIN clients (first priority services) in only one of the four counties. In the other three counties, sufficient resources for remedial education already exist, so the 8-percent funding is used to support skills assessments for GAIN clients. Under contract with GAIN, these assessments are conducted by the JTPA service offices in four counties. The SDA is paid by GAIN to provide the assessment service for GAIN clients once the SDA has spent all the available 8-percent funds.

BASICS: An 8-Percent Special Needs Grant

BASICS is the name of the 8-Percent Special Needs grant project funded at the Tuolumne County office of the MLJTA. The purpose of the BASICS project is to provide JTPA services to youth and adults who lack the literacy and basic skills necessary to benefit from the regular JTPA program available at MLJTA. BASICS provides literacy, work readiness, and job skills training. As discussed earlier, the workshop and OJT programs supported under JTPA Title II-A are primarily targeted to job placement for individuals without major employment barriers. BASICS is targeted to hard-to-serve clients: Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) clients who are not registered with GAIN, other JTPA adults with employment barriers, and youth who are at risk or who are actual dropouts.

The BASICS project is coordinated by a credentialed counselor/teacher employed by MLJTA. The coordinator is responsible for recruitment; intake and personal interviews with clients; administration of basic skills, vocational, and pre-employment assessments; development of educational/employment plans; referral to the education programs that are partners in the 8-percent grant; and monitoring of student progress.

Columbia College is primarily responsible for basic skills training, and both the college and the ROP provide occupational skills training for clients of the 8-percent project. Instructors at the Columbia College Learning Skills Center administer basic skills pre-tests and other assessments; they also design individualized programs for BASICS clients. MLJTA staff work with the college to secure student financial aid. Basic skills and General Education Development (GED) preparation training are offered at the Columbia College Learning Skills Center. The JTPA grant pays for a tutor to work with BASICS clients there. Some BASICS clients are referred to occupational training programs at the ROP or the community college.

Once the BASICS clients have completed the remedial/basic skills education, job skills training, or both, they return to the regular MLJTA program. Through the agency's general title programs, BASICS clients participate in the work readiness, job search, OJT, and job placement programs available to other MLJTA clients.

The GAIN Welfare-to-Work Program

As described earlier, the SDA conducts assessments for the county GAIN programs using a combination of JTPA 8-percent allocation funds and GAIN funds. The SDA also has contracts to conduct job club and job search services for GAIN clients. These services are provided by the JTPA staff in the four JTPA county program offices. GAIN clients are often co-enrolled in JTPA.

In the four counties served by the MLJTA, GAIN does little occupational training. As is true in most California counties, most GAIN clients are in assessment, job clubs, job search, or remedial education programs. The Mother Lode area GAIN programs may refer GAIN clients to a ROP or the college; however, little use of these resources has yet occurred.

San Diego SDA

SDA Administration

The San Diego Consortium and Private Industry Council (PIC) is a joint agency of the City and County of San Diego, which receives and administers JTPA funds throughout San Diego County. Employment and training policy is developed with joint oversight by the PIC and the Consortium Policy Board comprised of city and county elected officials.

The Consortium and PIC develop and administer the training plans, but, with the exception of JTPA Title III dislocated worker programs, they provide no services directly and limit their activity to administration of Title II service contracts. Each service provider must provide a full range of services, including intake, assessment, and placement. (The SDA claims this is more efficient.) In a few cases, service providers subcontract with other JTPA providers for specific program components. The SDA has performance-based JTPA contracts with thirty-five service providers; the majority are non-profit community-based organizations (CBOs), and the rest are LEAs and proprietary schools.

Unemployment in San Diego has been below five percent since 1985, and job growth is expected in every sector, especially in business and health services. Despite the low unemployment rate, there is still a high demand for services, especially adult basic education (ABE), English-as-a-Second Language (ESL), and GED services demanded by the county's huge Southeast Asian, Hispanic, and Filipino immigrant/refugee communities.

The Consortium and PIC claim that coordination with education institutions has made the most progress recently through the SDA's in-school programs for at-risk youth. The PIC has recently made a major effort to set up programs in the county's thirty-plus school districts, providing computer-based remediation, as well as personal and employment counseling to youth at risk of dropping out. Four-year dropout rates are more than forty percent for Hispanics in the San Diego Unified School District.

A big coup for vocational education was the designation of $1 million in JTPA 8-percent GAIN funds to a consortium of local institutions. Administrators at the Sweetwater High School District (HSD) and the San Diego Community College District (CCD) created a consortium of public education providers to coordinate twenty computer-based remediation labs throughout the county. They negotiated with the Department of Social Services (DSS) and PIC/RETC (Regional Employment and Training Consortium) to get the program funded with the JTPA 8-percent GAIN money. Initially, all the money for the centers came from JTPA, but as more centers were added, the JTPA share was reduced. Presently, ADA and DSS GAIN funds comprise the majority of the program resources.

The SDA also uses community colleges and adult education programs for some of their adult Title II-A programs. These include the Accounting Clerk and Secretary/Word Processing programs at Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD, individual referral programs at Sweetwater Union HSD and San Diego CCD (for older workers and refugees), and similar programs in other districts.

The Consortium and PIC are not satisfied with the state's administration of the thirty percent portion of the JTPA 8-percent program (the portions of the Education Coordination Grants not earmarked for the GAIN welfare-to-work program). In the past, they rarely submitted proposals themselves, but a number of local service providers did. About twenty proposals came through the PIC for PY89 approval, and four received funding last year by the California Department of Education (DOE). The PIC claimed they have no incentive to reject any proposals that come through because everyone is eager to see more program dollars coming into the county. The PIC would prefer to see the state drop the statewide Request for Proposal (RFP) process and give all the 8-percent funds to the SDAs by formula. That idea would probably not go over too well with the local education institutions who see the 8-percent funds as DOE money and have in the past resented having to send their proposals to the PIC for review.

Coordination between vocational education institutions and JTPA appears good in San Diego, due mostly to a high service demand and a willingness of program administrators and educators to utilize all available resources to meet that demand. There are some PIC policies that may discourage coordination, including extensive use of RFPs, refusal to be the sole source of job training services to vocational education providers, reliance on performance-based contracting, and extensive paperwork required of service providers who must do intake and assessment. The Consortium and PIC see their role as that of contract administrator and remain at arm's length to the actual design and provision of services. Thus, the joint agency is focused on "getting the biggest bang for the buck," and letting the service providers worry about providing the appropriate kinds of the training for the clients. The Consortium and PIC are apparently content in the belief that performance standards and contracts will ensure appropriate, high quality services.

Sweetwater Union High School District

Sweetwater Union HSD is a very large district centered in Chula Vista stretching the fourteen miles from San Diego to the Mexican border. The immigrant population is also large and requires ESL and other basic and vocational education services. To attempt to meet this demand, Sweetwater Union has been very aggressive and successful at bringing available resources into the district, including JTPA funding. Sweetwater serves forty-three thousand people in their adult education programs with about thirty percent of the ADA generated through its vocational education programs. Vocational programs include job search and pre-employment training, auto mechanics, bank teller, building maintenance, child care, electronics, construction, carpentry, nurse assistant, restaurant and

food services, and welding. Training is available in other program areas, including basic education (i.e., remediation, GED, and diploma programs), ESL, business education, civic education, foreign language training, home economics, and parent education.

Sweetwater has two Title II-A contracts with the Consortium and PIC, including a job search assistance class for the job ready and a more intensive individualized participant training program. This program provides assessment and counseling services with referral to one of the adult school's vocational or business education programs. Training is followed by job placement. Both contracts are performance-based, fixed cost contracts. Sweetwater staff claim they get little assistance from the state administration on how to work with the SDA and they cannot point to any state policies that promote coordination. However, they also say that the people at DOE know what programs exist and are successful at directing those who take the initiative to other institutions running coordinated programs.

Officials at Sweetwater believe PIC/RETC is concerned about spreading the money around evenly, according to geography and population—not according to current need. They claim Chula Vista has relatively more need than the city or north county areas, and yet they lack the political power to get their "fair share." The Consortium and PIC counter by saying they are trying to distribute the funds according to need, but that they are hampered by reliance on old 1980 census data and an inability to agree on how else to distribute the funds in the absence of more reliable data. Sweetwater claims their JTPA programs do not make money for the district, but they do allow them to offer services they could not otherwise afford to offer. The Title II-A contracts essentially pay for the support services and the extensive administrative/clerical costs. After intake and assessment, clients are mainstreamed into existing programs with costs covered through ADA.

Sweetwater was instrumental in forming the GAIN Remediation Adult Deliverers (GRAD) consortium that designed and operates the county's GAIN remediation centers in partnership with the SDA and the DSS. In early 1986, the Economic Development Department (EDD) was making the change to reserving fifty percent of the JTPA education coordination set-aside for GAIN services, and the county DSS office was developing their GAIN plan. The SDA, Sweetwater, and the San Diego CCD devised a plan to set up computerized learning labs for GAIN participants. At this time, they formed GRAD. GRAD worked with the SDA in the fall of 1986 to design the labs, select computer software, and train the staff and instructors Three labs were opened by the end of the year. In 1987, GRAD was able to use the demonstration sites to sell DSS on the concept.

Subsequently, DSS provided additional funding, and the system has grown tremendously. Now there are twenty-two centers operated by school and community college districts in the GRAD consortium. The SDA pays for start-up costs, learning disability experts, ESL curriculum development, some inservice program staff, and other operating costs in ten centers. Two-thirds of the total cost of operating the system comes from generated ADA (not counting initial start-up costs).

Sweetwater Union HSD also gets DSS referrals for GAIN participants seeking vocational training. These people are mainstreamed into existing programs. Attendance is taken daily and progress reports are sent to DSS on a bimonthly basis. Those finishing training take an exit test (or GED) and a final report is sent to DSS. Tracking is done without additional reimbursement from DSS, and to the dismay of some school principals.

San Diego County Department of Social Services—GAIN Coordination

Ray Koenig at the San Diego County DSS office claims he is the luckiest GAIN coordinator in the state because GRAD came to him, freeing him from having to search for basic skills remediation providers. Forty percent of the county's welfare population lacks basic reading and math skills, and twenty-five percent of those with a high school diploma also have significant skill deficiencies. Teens without a diploma are sent back to school to get one and hopefully receive more intensive counseling while they are there. Some school districts are better than others at providing educational alternatives and counseling for these dropouts, and DSS claims the process of setting up alternative education programs in thirty school districts is lengthy and arduous. The adults who need remediation or a GED are sent to the GAIN computer learning centers where the success rate is consistently better.

The San Diego DSS uses the state-mandated GAIN program model to sequence the following services: remediation, job search, vocational assessment, vocational training, and work experience. DSS contracts with the local EDD office to provide the initial job search training. Vocational assessment is provided by four community colleges under a DSS contract. Client files are then passed from the case managers to the Training Development Unit in charge of brokering individual vocational training slots with existing providers based on the results of the assessment and client interests. When the client enters training, the files are passed back to the case manager. Because many of the most job ready clients are placed in jobs prior to vocational training, only those with the greatest barriers to employment receive vocational training. This can be a problem for JTPA service providers filling slots in performance-based programs with DSS-referred GAIN clients.

The process of passing files from case managers to the Training Development Unit and then back again has created many administrative problems for DSS that have not all been worked out.

DSS has a Title II-A contract to provide OJT to four hundred GAIN clients that, in the coordinator's opinion, is more an incentive for employers to hire welfare recipients than an opportunity to improve the client's occupational skills. Those with some work skills and experience are eligible for OJT. It is never provided to those who have received vocational training through GAIN. Those who are not able to find employment after training are sent to the county-run PREP program (community work experience), often referred to at DSS as the "penalty box." The county has a sanction rate of eight percent.

The San Diego GAIN program began in October 1987. Since then, 24,331 clients have been enrolled in the program, but thirty-six percent of these clients were immediately deferred. Only six percent of the remaining clients who received services have been placed in vocational training through the program. An additional eighteen percent remained in self-initiated training, but it is not known whether they remained in remedial or vocational programs. Presently, sixty-three percent of the clients in training have received or are presently receiving remedial education. Only five percent of the clients seen by the program have had their cases closed as a result of employment (how many would have gotten off AFDC without the program is not known). However, fifty-two percent have found unsubsidized employment through the program, many of whom have had their grants reduced accordingly but still remain on the rolls. The implication is that the program is effective for getting people jobs, thereby reducing their cash grants, but those jobs are not high paying enough to get them dropped from the welfare rolls entirely. The program boasts a $31 million grant savings due to employment (about $2,500 per entered employment).

Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District

Grossmont Community College (GCC) has two Title II-A contracts with the Consortium and PIC for the secretary/word processing and accounting clerk programs, which they have been running for six years. They also do vocational assessment for GAIN clients referred by the county DSS office. Originally, the Title II-A programs were 8-percent projects initiated by the Chancellor's Office. The college was interested in upgrading their computer facilities and establishing linkages with private industry. The PIC told GCC to choose from five occupational areas the PIC was interested in filling,

leading to the development of the two programs. Some labs and classes are reserved for JTPA students and others are mixed. Those that are totally blocked off do not generate ADA, while the open classes do. Each program has forty-five JTPA students enrolled at a time. GCC does not apply for discretionary 8-percent funds. As a matter of fact, the administrators we spoke with did not know the program existed and assumed that all the money went to the GAIN program. (The SDA claims they notify their contractors annually regarding the availability of 8-percent funds through the state DOE).

GCC has a special vocational rehabilitation center that provides vocational assessment services for two hundred and thirty GAIN recipients through a $96,000 contract with DSS. GCC had trouble with the contract initially because DSS was not providing enough referrals for services. Subsequently, the contract was reduced from $150,000 to its present level. DSS funding pays for the salaries of Center personnel, with the college picking up staff benefits, facilities, supplies, and administration. The GCC money comes from a trust fund established through previous fee-for-service contracts because no ADA is generated. The assessment takes two days to complete and the results are presented to DSS in a three-page report. Attendance information and assessment reports are generated through a direct, on-line computer system developed by GCC (under a separate DSS contract), which is also being used at the other three community colleges that provide vocational assessment services.

San Francisco SDA

Coordination between the San Francisco CCD and the PIC has led to the development of few new programs and services. Most of the current coordinated programs were grandfathered in during the CETA period and have not been discontinued. The CCD had been the largest recipient of CETA funds, offering a diverse set of programs to program participants. Since the transition to JTPA, most of those contracts have been dropped in favor of CBOs. The PIC claims that the CCD's share of the total job training pie has remained the same, but that the pie has shrunk considerably from an average funding level of about $50 million in the last few CETA years to $7 million this year.

The interesting story in San Francisco is the implementation of the GAIN program. What began as a cooperative planning process involving a diverse group of interested parties has turned into a very divisive issue, with many of the key players expressing

pessimism about program effectiveness, as well as the ability of their counterparts in other agencies to successfully implement the program.

JTPA Programs Coordinated with the Community College District

Currently, the CCD provides instructors to seven JTPA 78-percent funded CBOs who teach classes in ESL, GED, computer skills, automotive service, and other service occupations. This program is a holdover from CETA when these and other CBOs received this service. The CCD generates ADA for teaching these classes at the CBO and lists them in their non-credit division catalogue. Unfilled seats must be made available to non-JTPA eligible community college students. Like all programs in the non-credit division, these programs are open-entry/open-exit. There is no exchange of funds between the CCD and the PIC or CBO, merely a Memorandum of Understanding specifying logistical details. This arrangement benefits all three parties because the CBO gets a JTPA contract with reduced program costs, the PIC does not have to pay the CBO for those additional costs, and the CCD generates additional ADA without overhead expenses. However, by the CCD's own admission, they are subsidizing the competition by helping the CBO offer services to the PIC for less than they could. The PIC claims the arrangement allows them to offer training in specific occupations to targeted JTPA populations that would otherwise not be offered.

The CCD has two direct contracts with the PIC to provide basic skills remediation and word processing training on PIC-owned computers. Funding for the remediation program comes from the GAIN 8-percent allocation (the fifty percent of the JTPA 8-percent set-aside used in California to serve GAIN and GAIN-eligible clients), and the word processing program is Title II-A funded. The Title II-A-funded program has a ninth grade reading level requirement, so GAIN-eligible clients in the remediation program can graduate and go through the Title II-A program which is designed to target welfare recipients. The word processing program was funded through a cost-reimbursement contract until the beginning of PY88 when it was changed to a performance-based contract (tied to job placements).

On November 1, 1988, GAIN was officially implemented in San Francisco and 8-percent GAIN programs were required to train GAIN participants (not just GAIN-eligible clients as had been the case previously). Unfortunately, none of the program's participants volunteered for GAIN and the program began to loose money because the program received reimbursements only for placing GAIN participants. In addition, the CCD

claimed the few referrals they were getting from the San Francisco County DSS were not properly assessed and did not meet the program eligibility requirements. This and other GAIN 8-percent programs were subsequently switched back to cost-reimbursement contracts to prevent the program operators from losing money.

The Community College and GAIN

Currently, DSS relies on the CCD to conduct an educational assessment of all newly enrolled GAIN participants to determine if they need basic skills remediation. The district is reimbursed for this service by DSS. Most GAIN clients subsequently receive GED, ABE, and ESL services at the Community College Centers (non-credit division) at no cost to DSS. These programs are funded through the Community College and ABE systems. In addition, the PIC has funded three combination ABE/vocational skills programs at CBOs using GAIN 8-percent funds. DSS claims that the CCD is not making enough referrals to the CBO-run ABE/vocational skills programs after educational assessment, and is instead channeling GAIN participants into their own programs.

After basic skills remediation, the client is sent back to DSS to participate in a job club. If unsuccessful in finding a job, they are then returned to the CCD for a vocational assessment. The results are sent back to DSS and the case manager works out the next step (usually referral to the PIC for vocational training). This vocational assessment contract was discontinued July 1, 1989, because DSS was not satisfied with the quality of the CCD assessment results and because of delays in starting up the service. The DSS GAIN director stated that other counties had complained about community college vocational assessments as well, citing target career recommendations that were unreasonably high, lack of supporting detail about how recommendations were determined, or training recommendations beyond the capability of the current GAIN system. Subsequently, DSS brought the vocational assessment service in-house and hired a single vocational counselor in October 1989 (after a three month delay) whose employment was later terminated in January 1990. As of March 1990, DSS had yet to hire a replacement specialist to conduct adult vocational assessment, a situation which has slowed the flow of GAIN clients through the system.

GAIN Planning and the PIC

Currently, there are approximately seven thousand GAIN-eligible welfare recipients in the county, a figure that will rise to more than ten thousand when JOBS is implemented and parents with children aged three through six are added to the program client base. As

of July 1989 (eight months after the start of the program), there were nine hundred and seventy-seven welfare recipients registered as GAIN participants. Participants are deferred if they are substance abusers, are currently working more than fifteen hours per week, or are experiencing some kind of family crisis.

Nearly one-third of the participants are currently classified as unassigned. Very often these are people who tell their case workers they want time to think about where they are headed and then fail to return for further counseling. Subsequently, they become "lost" and need to be "found" again by case worker inquiries. Many of the unassigned may actually have grounds for deferral such as drug or alcohol dependency, which have yet to be discovered by the case worker. The DSS appears to be under pressure to reduce the number of unassigned participants; however, it has yet to sanction a single participant and hopes to avoid that step.

Also worth noting is that sixty-five percent of the "active" participants in the program are receiving ABE, ESL, or general education services in preparation for vocational training. This figure dramatizes the enormous need for remediation among the GAIN-eligible population. Only eleven percent have reached vocational training after nine months of program operation. All of these people were welfare recipients enrolled in GAIN 8-percent training programs who volunteered for GAIN after the program was implemented.

The GAIN planning process began three years ago and was headed by the PIC with the participation of DSS, CCD, the school district, CBOs, and welfare rights groups. Initially, the county DSS office was not interested in GAIN planning and did not object when the PIC was authorized by the Mayor to take the lead in writing the plan. The present DSS GAIN director was not hired until the end of November (after the program was implemented). She is presently attempting to put training decisions back in the hands of DSS case workers. As mentioned, the vocational assessment component has already been brought in-house, though the plan called for the CCD to provide this service. Both the PIC and DSS were unable to provide a current version of the county GAIN plan, claiming it had been amended so many times that an accurate version does not exist.

According to the plan, the PIC is to conduct all GAIN vocational training; however, now DSS wants to reserve the ability to contract with other training providers and make referrals as they see fit. Over the past few months, the PIC has refused to issue subcontracts for GAIN vocational training because there is not yet enough client flow to

support the fixed-unit cost subcontracts that are mandated by GAIN. Service providers would lose money on unfilled classes reserved for GAIN participants. Recently, DSS has come up with some additional GAIN money to do their own contracting. They recently issued an RFP in an attempt to get around the fixed-cost contracting dilemma and insure adequate training capacity when it is needed. Slowly but surely the county plan is unraveling. The new GAIN director is trying to assert greater DSS control over its own program and is willing to amend the plan to do it—a process that has alienated those who had participated in GAIN planning in the years before she was hired. The PIC can do nothing more than object because, ultimately, it is a DSS program.

Use of 8-Percent Funds

The PIC claims that since November 1988 when GAIN was implemented, the 8-percent program has been virtually inoperable. Much of the GAIN money has gone unspent this year because so few GAIN participants have been referred to the PIC's GAIN programs. One CBO has gone into trusteeship, due, in part, to money lost on PIC GAIN 8-percent contracts. There also seems to be disagreement between the DSS and the PIC over what services should be provided with 8-percent funds. The PIC wants to run performance-based programs that end in jobs, but DSS sees performance-based contracting as unnecessary, especially for programs providing remedial education. The PIC combination training programs do not easily fit into the DSS flow chart, which provides for discrete services delivered sequentially.

The PIC is not a major player in the other part of the state's 8-percent program (the 30-percent grants), limiting its role to dissemination of RFP information to potential respondents, signing off on other agencies' applications as being non-duplicative, and occasionally being the co-applicant for funds with another service provider. Presently, there are seven or eight "30-percent" contracts in San Francisco, all of which CBOs developed at their own initiative. The CCD has not had its own 8-percent contract in several years because no one on staff has time to write the proposals. (They have no money to hire someone to do it.) According to the PIC, large organizations do not apply for the money because grants are limited to $50,000 and, therefore, not worth the effort. Nevertheless, the PIC estimates San Francisco is getting more out of this fund in total dollars than they could expect to get if it were allocated by formula.

Shasta County

Shasta County is a rural county in Northern California. Its only major city, Redding, has a small industrial base of light manufacturing, with service support for the area's logging and tourist industries the principal job market in the county. The county is overwhelmingly white, with a few native Americans and a growing southeast Asian population.

Coordination between service agencies in Shasta County seems to be quite good at the present time. Coordination activities include cooperative agreements with the Shasta HSD, the ROP, the Shasta CCD, and the local GAIN office. However, these coordination activities have been a fairly recent development over the last couple of years.

The High School District

The PIC has a cooperative agreement with the Shasta HSD to run two remedial/basic education "Learning Centers"—one at the PIC office in Redding and one at Gateway Shopping Center in the city of Anderson (a few miles south of Redding). Teachers at these programs also teach at the two high schools in the area: Shasta High School and Anderson High School. The program serves adult and youth dropouts who are assisted in obtaining their high school diplomas or GED certificates. The Learning Centers use the Plato computer-assisted instruction program. The PIC "shares" ADA with the high school district: the PIC bills the high school district for one-half of the ADA for each student. This appears to be a win/win situation, in which the high schools re-enrolls high school dropouts through the PIC, and the PIC receives state revenues through the school district to fund its programs.

The Regional Occupational Program (ROP)

If a client's basic skills are inadequate for the workplace, they may develop or upgrade their job skills at the local ROP. Cooperation between the PIC and the ROP started with a conversation between the PIC chair and the ROP director on an airplane trip from Sacramento. The PIC chair mentioned that the SDA was planning to offer a clerical skills program at the PIC office because they could not find another open-entry/open-exit type of program. The director of the ROP then took the lead in developing such a program at the ROP. Now, the PIC guarantees fifteen clerical students per semester to the ROP and underwrites any losses the ROP might incur in this program (e.g., going over their "cap" because of the JTPA clients and, therefore, not receiving ADA for those students).

Shasta College

The Shasta County PIC has just recently started sending JTPA clients to the community college. The county's GAIN program has a contract with Shasta College to conduct job training for welfare clients. In a partnership with Shasta College, the PIC administers this contract for the college and assumes all of the grant management responsibilities for the funds.

GAIN in Shasta County

The GAIN office for the county is just across the street from the PIC and, according to the PIC staff, this facilitates good communication and coordination between GAIN and PIC. This seems to be especially true at the lead staff level. The PIC will operate four activities for GAIN in Shasta County: (1) Job Services (job club, job search, supervised job search, and unsupervised job search); (2) Vocational Training (at Shasta College, ROP, the high schools, or CBOs), (3) OJT; and (4) ninety-day supervised job search (after job training). GAIN-related activities at the PIC include OJT "brokering" with local industry on a grant from GAIN; "fast track" remedial education through the PIC's Plato system, with a GED or high school diploma as an outcome; and case management services for each GAIN client, including Employability Development Plans (EDPs) that cover not only remediation but also job skills and employability training. Although GAIN clients pose special challenges for the PIC (lack of client motivation and/or basic skills), consensus at the PIC was that GAIN in Shasta County was working well so far.

Overall, coordination between services in Shasta County is good and is improving over time. It is not clear, however, that coordination has been especially good in the past. Most of these examples of coordination had been started in the last few years.